

**GREEK PHILOSOPHY AND CHRISTIAN  
TRADITION IN ST. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS :  
UNITY-TRIPLICITY**

Despo Ath. Lialiou

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD  
at the  
University of St Andrews



1982

Full metadata for this item is available in  
St Andrews Research Repository  
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/13737>

This item is protected by original copyright

Greek Philosophy and Christian Tradition  
in St. Gregory of Nazianzus:  
Unity-Triplicity

Being a thesis presented by  
Despo Ath. Lialiou  
to the University of St. Andrews  
in application for the  
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
July 1981





ProQuest Number: 10166678

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10166678

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Th 9715

CERTIFICATE

I certify that *Miss Despo Hudson* has fulfilled the conditions of the resolution of the University Court, 1967, No.1 and that she is qualified to submit this thesis in application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

.....

## A B S T R A C T

The purpose of this thesis is the analysis of the way by which ST.GREGORY the Theologian used Greek philosophy and religious ideas of Classical Hellenism in order to formulate the Christian Trinitarian Dogma, which, according to ST.GREGORY, is the only and unique criterion for approaching "ὁρθόδοξος" the Christian Cosmology and Anthropology. The very confusion between Greek philosophy and the dogmatic doctrine of Greek Fathers stems from the fact that a common terminology exists on both sides. This was not a matter of confusion for ST. GREGORY since he understood the Holy Dispensation as the very mystery of God's manifestation through the history of Creation.

Exposing the theological presuppositions he defines the framework according to which the Orthodox theologian must theologize without running the risk of becoming a heretic. Purification, inactivity, and finally theoria constitutes the life of the theologian par excellence. The O.T. and the N.T. as well as the Ecclesiastical tradition are the sources of the Orthodox Dogma, the declaration of which is characterized by measure and symmetry (Via Media), in contrast to the heretical views which always move to extremes. Furthermore for ST.GREGORY the Christian theologian is the true philosopher who after painful preparation reaches such a level of objectivity that he becomes a voice of the Holy Spirit.

In the same framework of theological objectivity ST.GREGORY examines the divine Names. He classifies Them into, a) Names proper to Essence, and b) Common Names of the divine Authority and of Dispensation. This latter introduces the Triplicity of the Persons within the God-head, whereas the Former<sup>ones</sup> state Its Unity.

On the other hand ST.GREGORY is particularly aware of Greek Monotheism, either that of the philosophers or of theurgical religion,

but he calls the latter polytheia because of its abstract notion of Oneness for a multiplicity of gods. In addition, instead of an abstract essence of the philosophers and their theory of ontological subordination<sup>of</sup> the Hypostaseis, a theory which leads towards coeternity of the ultimate Principle with Creation, ST. GREGORY introduces the paradoxical schema "Μονὰς ἐν Τριάδι", and vice versa, and in so doing he excludes a non-hypostatized essence or three non-substantial Hypostaseis.

ST. GREGORY follows ST. ATHANASIUS concerning the Trinitarian Dogma and shares with the so called Cappadocian Fathers the main characteristics of the Cappadocian Trinitarian doctrine about Unity and Triplicity of God. Furthermore he uses the term homousion to safeguard and confess the Unity of the three Hypostaseis and to declare unambiguously the divinity of the Holy Spirit, Whom he clearly calls "Θεός". This statement is ST. GREGORY's personal contribution to formulation of the Trinitarian Dogma, a point that later became the rule of Orthodoxy, particularly concerning the Eastern Church.

The last chapter is devoted to the question of the Trinitarian Images, which the heretics used in order to explain away the "ἡραδόξον" character of the theologia by means of logical devices. Although ST. GREGORY is reluctant to apply images borrowed from the created nature to the Persons of the Holy Trinity, he does so in a moderate and qualified way in order to expose and refute only the heretical positions.

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the following thesis is based on the results of research carried out by myself, that it is my own composition and that it has not previously been presented for a higher degree. The research was carried out at the University of St. Andrews under the supervision of Dr James S. Alexander.

.....

Dedicated to

the Archbishop of Thyateira and Great Britain METHODIUS

and to

the Metropolitan of Serbia and Kozanë DIONYSIOS.

"Οἶμαι δὲ πᾶσιν ἀνωμολογῆσαι τῶν νοῦν ἔχόντων, παιδεύειν τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀγαθῶν εἶναι τὸ πρῶτον· οὐ γὰρ  
τὴν μόνην τὴν εὐγενεστέραν, ἢ ἡμετέραν, ἢ πᾶν τὸ ἐν λόγῳ κομψὸν καὶ φηστίμον ἀτιμάζουσα, μόνη ἔχεται  
τῆς σωτηρίας, καὶ τοῦ κόσμου τῶν νοουμένων. ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἔξωθεν, ἣν οἱ πολλοὶ φιλοτιμῶν διαπτύουσιν,  
ὡς ἐπίβουλον καὶ σφαλεράν, καὶ θεοῦ πόρρω ἑστῆσαν, κακῶς εἰδότες... οὐκ οὖν ἀτιμαστέον τὴν  
παιδεύειν, ὅτι τοῦτο δοκεῖ τισιν· ἀλλὰ σκαιοὺς καὶ ἀπαιδεύτους ὑποληπτέον τοὺς οὕτως  
ἔχοντας, οἳ βούλονται ἂν πάντας εἶναι καθ' ἑαυτούς, ἵνα ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τὸ κατ' αὐτοὺς κρύπτηται  
καὶ τοὺς τῆς ἀπαιδευσίας ἐλέγχους διαδιδράσκωσιν".

## CONTENTS.

### ABBREVIATIONS

i-ii

### INTRODUCTION

i - 9

### CHAP. I, Theological Presuppositions.

10 - 24

#### " II, The Revelation of God - The Divine Names

25 - 66

#### " III, Greek Monotheism

67 - 72

#### " IV, Holy Trinity - Creation

73 - 104

#### " V, Trinitarian Formulation

105 - 149

#### " VI, Trinitarian Images

150 - 183

### CONCLUSION

184 - 190

### NOTES

#### INTROD.

191 - 194

#### CHAP. I

195 - 202

#### " II

203 - 216

#### " III

217 - 218

#### " IV

219 - 227

#### " V

228 - 247

#### " VI

248 - 257

### BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources - Modern Works

258 - 274

### APPENDIX I

275 - 276

#### II

277 - 278

#### III

279 - 280

#### IV

281

#### V

282

### NOTES



APPENDIX I

283-284

II

285-287

III

288

V

289

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ATR	Anglican Theological Review
BZ	Byzantinische Zeitschrift
CQ	Classical Quarterly
CH	Church History
CHTH	Church and Theology [Ἐκκλησία καὶ Θεολογία]
CJ	Classical Journal
CPH	Classical Philology
DOP	Dumbarton Oaks Papers
DSpir	Dictionnaire de Spiritualité
ECHQ	Eastern Churches Quarterly
Ekkl	Ἐκκλησία
ETHE	ἡθικὴ καὶ θρησκευτικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία
GOTR	Greek Orthodox Theological Review
GRBS	Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies
HTHR	Harvard Theological Review
ITQ	Irish Theological Quarterly
JEH	Journal of Ecclesiastical History
JR	Journal of Religion
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies
JTHS	Journal of Theological Studies
KYR	KYRIAKON (Festschrift J. Quasten, Münster Westf 1970), vol. 1-2
MSR	Mélanges de science religieuse

NPNF	A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church
P.G.	Migne, Patrologia, series Graeca
P.L.	Migne, Patrologia, series Latina
REB	Revue des études Byzantines
REG	Revue des études Greques
RQ	Rennaissance Quarterly
RHE	Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique
RSR	Recherches de science religieuse
SC	Sources Chrétiennes
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
Sob	Sobornost
SP	Studia Patristica
STVTHQ	St. Vladimir Theological Quarterly
VC	Vigiliae Christianae
ZAM	Zeitschrift für Askese und Mystik

## INTRODUCTION

The Christians' attitude towards pagan culture from the days of the early Church must be examined in relation to the general framework of the secular world.<sup>1</sup> Although this subject had occupied the ecclesiastical authors and the Fathers in the first centuries<sup>2</sup>, only in the fourth century did they adopt a unique line in order to face the problem of Hellenism as a danger from outside, particularly after JULIAN'S edict by which he forbade Christians either to learn or to teach ancient Greek literature.<sup>3</sup> As the Church rose up in the Greco-Roman world, it was necessary for Her to start out from this world.<sup>4</sup>

As J. PLAGNIEUX remarked<sup>5</sup>, there were three intellectual trends at the beginning of the fourth century; pagan Hellenism, the heretical sects of Christian Hellenism and Orthodox Hellenism. In the same period the existing education fell into three categories.<sup>6</sup> Orthography implied the capacity to read, speak and write the standardized Greek; grammar was the study of the classical Greek authors, not only for their style, but for their moral teaching as well, and finally there were the higher studies of Rhetoric and Law, Sophistry and Philosophy.<sup>7</sup> Rhetoric was the art of the right use of reason; Law expressed the conception of jurisprudence, and Sophistry applied a literary interpretation to Greek poetry, history and classical Philosophy.<sup>8</sup> At the highest level of pagan education, pure Philosophy was the interpretation of the cardinal principles<sup>9</sup> as the theoretical aspect of the ancient religion. In the fourth century, the school which offered a pure philosophical education continued to be only the Academia in Athens, and there were some

occasional cases of philosophers within the Roman Empire from Alexandria to Rome.<sup>10</sup>

ST. GREGORY came from the rich nobility of Cappadocia<sup>11</sup> and he had the possibility of an accomplished education, as did all the sons of the wealthy aristocratic families, the elite of his time. Members of these families, with social prestige, often occupied high administrative offices and they cherished their Hellenic heritage.<sup>12</sup> But ST. GREGORY'S mother was a zealous Christian and his father was converted to Christianity from Hypsistarianism, a hybrid Jewish-pagan sect and became bishop of the country town of Nazianzus. Gregory was born in 329-30 near there on an estate at Arianzus belonging to his family.<sup>13</sup>

ST. GREGORY received his first education in Nazianzus, but soon he moved to Caesarea, the capital of the province<sup>14</sup>. Here he probably made his first acquaintance with ST. BASIL, a young man of the same intellectual and social milieu.<sup>15</sup> Shortly afterwards Basil left for Constantinople, while ST. GREGORY ~~firstly~~ attended the school of Oratory in Caesarea in Palestine, which at that time was famous<sup>16</sup>, having as preceptor the rhetorician THESPESIUS<sup>17</sup>, and afterwards went to Alexandria. Although we have no particular information about his studies here, it would not be exaggerating to say that his inclination towards middle Platonism, his acquaintance with DIDYMUS and with ORIGEN'S works as well as his reverence for ST. ATHANASIUS are indebted to this residence.<sup>18</sup> About A.D. 350 he departed from Alexandria to Athens, viz. the seat of learning.

In his oration "In Laudem Basilii Magni"<sup>19</sup> he describes the quality of the higher education in Athens of the middle of the fourth century; he gives many details of the organization of various academic fields and courses of secular studies in a city still maintaining its pagan tradition to a large extent. At that time Athens was the most celebrated centre of learning in Greece and the students came from many Asiatic provinces and even from the distant Armenia. Except the Academia, about which ST. GREGORY hints only, he talks quite extensively about the courses on Sophistry, which were predominant, to such an extent that ST. GREGORY might say "σοφιστομανούσιν Ἀθηνῶσι τῶν γένων οἱ πλείστοι".<sup>20</sup> From EUNAPIUS, ST. GREGORY'S contemporary, "Vitae Sophistarum", and from his Or. 43 we may have an idea about the schools of Sophistry; every sophist had his own school and the students crowded round their teachers with incredible zeal.<sup>21</sup> Beyond these schools, there existed the public seat of Sophistry from the time of MARCUS AURELIUS.<sup>22</sup>

Somewhat later in Athens, ST. BASIL arrived and they studied together<sup>23</sup>, especially with the sophists HIMERIUS and PROAERESIOUS; for the latter, EUNAPIUS says that he seemed to be a Christian.<sup>24</sup> ST. GREGORY himself dedicated an epitaph poem to his teacher, with great admiration, where he characterizes Proaeresius as sophist, "... ἀλλὰ σοφιστῶν / πᾶν γένος ὑψιλόγων εἶκε προαίρεσι".<sup>25</sup> During their rather long residence at Athens they might have heard several sophists in succession, who were not Christians, as Athens was the most celebrated seat of heathenism in Greece<sup>26</sup>, and of course the majority of the teachers were pagans. But the two friends maintained a deep devotion to Christian

belief, although pagan education had a great repute for ST. GREGORY. For example, criticism that he makes against those of the Christians who denied the Greek education, is of a paramount importance; he does this after a long career in the ecclesiastical life, and after a precise knowledge of the misuse of the Greek education by the heretics. The argumentation comes from the Epitaph Oratio to ST. BASIL. First of all ST. GREGORY says that education, whether Christian or external one ("ἐξωθεν"), is of a great advantage for the Christians, <sup>and then he stresses</sup> the "ἐξωθεν", viz. the Greek education, which many Christians abhorred as dangerous. On the contrary, ST. GREGORY admits that both BASIL and himself received from the secular literature "τὸ ἐξεταστικὸν τε καὶ θεωρητικὸν" <sup>27</sup>, while they rejected the idolatry of the Greek world. In turn he explains that <sup>only</sup> men who desire to hide themselves dishonour education: "Ὅνκουσιν ἀτιμαστέον τὴν παιδείαν, ὅτι τοῦτο δοκεῖ τοῖσιν. ἀλλὰ σκαίους καὶ ἀπαιδέτους ὑποληπτέον τοὺς οὕτως ἔχοντας, οἱ βούλονται ἂν ἅπαντας εἶναι καθ' ἑαυτούς, ἡρώεντῳ κοινῶ τὸ κατ' αὐτοὺς κρύπτεται, καὶ τοὺς τῆς ἀπαιδευσίας ἐλέγχους δια-  
διδράσκουσιν" <sup>28</sup>

They studied rhetoric, grammar, mathematics, music, astronomy, elements of medicine and philosophy. Furthermore, ST. GREGORY himself defines the kind of philosophy they studied by characterizing it as "διαλεκτική" (dialectics) <sup>29</sup>; that means, they did not study pure philosophy in Academia where the Neoplatonic tradition presented at that time a theurgical character. From PHILOSTRATUS we know that ancient sophistry was something higher than rhetoric and lower than pure

philosophy; he says that sophistry is " ῥητορικὴ φιλοσοφία"<sup>30</sup>, and sophists " οἱ παλαιοὶ ῥηπνόμεζον οὐ μόνον τοὺς ὑπερφωνοῦντας τε καὶ λαμπροὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν φιλοσόφων τοὺς ἐν ᾧρεῖα ἑρμηνεύοντας ".<sup>31</sup>

Likewise ST. GREGORY connects it with grammar, in the broadest meaning of the term<sup>32</sup>, and philosophy as well.<sup>33</sup>

The testimony that JULIAN, the later emperor, was a student in Athens at the same time, comes from EUNAPIUS in his <sup>Life of</sup> PROAERESIOS', who was also JULIAN'S teacher in sophistry.<sup>34</sup>

On the other hand, ST. GREGORY informs us that JULIAN was attached to the advocates of heathenism, and that he particularly went to Athens with this purpose.<sup>35</sup>

For ST. BASIL and himself, ST. GREGORY says that they knew only two ways; the one led to the Christian buildings (" ἱεροὶ οἴκοι ") and the teachers there, the

other to " ἐξωθεν " instructors. This latter phrase does not mean that they attended any course at the Academia, because this school had

developed theurgical interests by the influence of the Pergamene school and the Iamblichian tradition, inadmissible to the Christian faith.

Soon after, in the end of the year 361 JULIAN forbade Christians to be teachers of Greek education, an act not irrelevant to his interests in Neoplatonism and the practice of paganism.

It seems quite probable that ST. GREGORY'S education in Athens was on the level of sophistry. This is confirmed by the fact that after the end of his academic study, his teachers and fellow students desired to retain him in Athens, as he might take possession of the sophistic chair.<sup>36</sup>

The matter of the chairs in Athens at that time has not been



examined in detail. From the sources we know that at least a chair of philosophy<sup>37</sup>, another one of sophistry<sup>38</sup> and a third one of politics<sup>39</sup> viz. rhetoric, existed in Athens and whose holders were paid by the state; as regards <sup>seniority of</sup> honour, the order of the chairs was as follows: philosophy, sophistry, rhetoric-politics.<sup>40</sup>

ST. GREGORY's biographer, the Presbyter GREGORIUS, who based his writing on ST. GREGORY's works and the ecclesiastical historians SOCRATES and SOZOMENUS, says that " Γρηγόριος δὲ ἀπρὶς κατείχετο τοῖς Ἀθηναίων φοιτηταῖς, μήτε τὴν ἐξόδον αὐτῶν συγχωροῦσι, καὶ παιδεύειν αὐτοὺς ἐκλιπαροῦσι, τὸν τε σοφιστικὸν ὁρὸν παρακαλοῦσι δέχεσθαι".<sup>41</sup> As far as we could examine, we found two cases in which ST. GREGORY seems to regard himself as a sophist<sup>42</sup>, but there is not any evidence according to which he admits for himself the title of the Greek philosopher. It happens because for ST. GREGORY the term philosophy bears the meaning of the life in Christ<sup>43</sup>, the true philosophy, since the Neoplatonic tradition ceased at that time to be the pure structure of human reason and became modified by religious faith and mysticism, as we have already noticed.

We will not enter into any further details of ST. GREGORY's life, a task which would <sup>take us</sup> beyond the purely theological<sup>44</sup> purpose of this treatise, but we will tackle only a particular point of his ecclesiastical career, which might help us to comprehend his doctrine of the Holy Trinity, viz. his role in the second Oecumenical Council.

The time between the years 379-381 is the most fertile and important. In 379 ST. GREGORY was invited by the orthodox minority at Constantinople, where he soon became the predominant figure of the struggle against the Arians and Pneumatomachians. When THEODOSIUS entered into Constantinople for the Christmas festival in the year 380, having found ST. GREGORY as leader of the Nicene party, he recognized him as bishop of the capital.<sup>45</sup> Surely the Cappadocians and Meletians in Antioch were ST. GREGORY's supporters, but the dogmatic terms were discussed broadly and the doubt about the orthodoxy of everyone was a common phenomenon. THEODOSIUS convoked a council, which<sup>was</sup> held in May 381, afterwards known as the Second Oecumenical. Before this the Meletian party had organized a Council in Antioch in the year 379 and MELETIUS went early to Constantinople. In fact, he was summoned as bishop of Antioch, not PAULINUS<sup>46</sup>, with whom the West communicated, and <sup>he was</sup> until his death <sup>he was</sup> the president of the Council of Constantinople. MELETIUS tried to secure ST. GREGORY's position as bishop of the capital, but when they arrived, the bishops of Egypt and Macedonia objected to this situation, which had been planned by the Eastern bishops, viz. Meletians and Cappadocians, and they demanded, that ST. GREGORY should retire for canonical reasons. What the real reason for this objection was is apparent from the dogmatic decisions of the Fathers of the Second Oecumenical Council; they did not adopt ST. GREGORY's doctrine about (a) the homousion of the Holy Spirit, (b) the confession that the Holy Spirit that He is "ΘΕΟΣ", like as the Father and the Son.<sup>47</sup> Finally before his departure ST. GREGORY delivered a very important sermon

In the presence of the 150 Holy Fathers of the assembly, and returned first to Nazianzus and then to his family's estate at Arianzus, where he died in 389-390, insisting to the end, on his Trinitarian doctrine, which later on became the rule of orthodoxy.<sup>48</sup> The purpose of his oration Supremum Vale was to be a kind of confession vis-à-vis the responsible bishops of the Council, and represented the witness of the orthodox Christians of the capital, who were his congregation during the very crucial years 379-381. Although he foresaw the decision, he tried, sacrificing himself, to warn their readiness, in order that they might recognize the peril which existed in a moderate solution to the Pneumatomachian heresy. Paragr. 15 of the Supremum

Vale is explicitly characteristic of ST. GREGORY's view. As it summarizes his general scope; it needs to be quoted in full, " Ἐν μὲν οὖν καὶ σύντομον πρόγραμμα τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς λόγου, καὶ οἷον στηλογραφία τις πᾶσι γνώριμος, ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, γνήσιος ὢν τῆς Τριάδος προσκυνητῆς, ὡς δαῖττον ἄντινα διαζευχθῆναι τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης, ἢ τι τῶν τριῶν ἐν διαζεύξαι τῆς θεότητος, σύμφρονες, ὁμότηλοι, ἐν λόγῳ πρὸς τε ἀλλήλους καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ τὴν Τριάδα κρατοῦμενοι. τὰ δὲ καθ' ἕκαστον, ἵν' ἐπέχω συντόμως, ἀναρχον, καὶ ἀρχή, καὶ τὸ μετὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς, εἷς θεός. Οὐτε τοῦ ἀναρχοῦ τὸ ἀναρχον φύσις, ἢ τὸ ἀγέννητον. οὐδεμία γὰρ φύσις ὅτι μή τόδε ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ὅτι τόδε. Ἡ τοῦ ὄντος θέσις, οὐχὶ τοῦ μή ὄντος ἀναίρεσις. Οὐτε ἡ ἀρχή, τὸ ἀρχεῖν εἶναι, τοῦ ἀναρχοῦ διείργεται. Οὐ γὰρ φύσις αὐτῷ ἢ ἀρχή, ὥσπερ οὐδ' ἐκείνῳ τὸ ἀναρχον. Περὶ γὰρ τὴν φύσιν, οὐ ταῦτα φύσις. Καὶ τὸ μετὰ τοῦ ἀναρχοῦ, καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς, οὐκ ἄλλο τι, ἢ ὅπερ

ἐκεῖνα. Ὁνομα δέ, τῷ μὲν ἀνάρχῳ, Πατρί· τῇ δὲ ἀρ-  
 χῇ, Υἱός· τῷ δὲ μετὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς, Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Φύσις δὲ τοῖς  
 τρισὶ μίᾳ, θεός. Ἐνωσις δέ, ὁ Πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ, καὶ πρὸς ὃν  
 ἀνάγεται τὰ ἐξῆς· ὡς συναλείφεται, ἀλλ' ὡς ἔχεται, μήτε χρόνου  
 διερχόντος, μήτε θελήματος, μήτε δυνάμεως... οἷς δὲ ἀπολῇ  
 φύσις καὶ τὸ εἶναι ταῦτόν, τούτοις καὶ τὸ ἐν κυρίον".<sup>49</sup>

Later in his poetry he comes back to the same topic and again he admits that he failed because he confessed the Holy Trinity, the one God.<sup>50</sup> That the canonical reasons were only the pretext, is obvious from the fact that he immediately took charge of the diocese of Nazianzus till the year 384, although he had been ordained bishop of Sasima.<sup>51</sup> In turn we will try to focus our study on the fundamental point of his Trinitarian doctrine and its relation to the general articulation of the dogma by the Greek Fathers.

## CHAPTER I

### THEOLOGICAL PRESUPPOSITIONS

For the ancient world, religion is the element which penetrates the whole understanding of the Universe. In the background of such an idea was the aspect that man's origin is of a divine character. On the other hand the Greek philosophers, who are called "φυσικοί", very early had ascertained that the world around them seemed <sup>to be</sup> a world of changes and illusions. Obviously the search for something immutable and immortal fulfilled the desire of a knowledge beyond the world of phenomena, namely a kind of dualism which was later defined by PLATO as the soul's kinship with the divine and its preexistence and immortality.<sup>1</sup> Through the idea of the divine origin of the soul the Greek philosophers, till DAMASCIUS, the last Diadochus of <sup>the</sup> Academia, interpreted the perceptible world and the noetic and divine Reality. In actuality they produced a system strictly and logically articulated and based upon immutable categories.

<sup>the rise of</sup>  
But with <sup>the</sup> Christian belief the fundamental ontological order from God to the created order of the Greeks was destroyed by the doctrine of creation ex nihilo, as we will see especially in chapter IV. The philosophical dualism, however, remained in the doctrine of the Church, but the dualism between the spiritual and the corporeal element was overcome by the Fathers in their doctrine of the Ascension of Christ, which introduced ~~the whole~~ man, viz. mind, soul and the body in the glory of the Holy Trinity. Furthermore ST. GREGORY says that reason

which proceeds from God, <sup>in man</sup> which is implanted from the beginning, elevates us up to God even through the visible world.<sup>2</sup> Thus, as "λογικός" we are capable of contemplating of the Incarnate Logos in the Holy Spirit <sup>which</sup> is the only way to hold fast to the Holy Trinity. So man becomes by grace a relative of God through the archetypical love, which is the soteriological presupposition of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.<sup>3</sup> ST. GREGORY'S language here is reminiscent of PLATO'S Epist. 7:<sup>4</sup> "Εἴ τις ὑμῶν τούτων τῷ ἔρωτι κάτοχος, ὃ δὲν ὁ λέγων, καὶ τῷ ποτε πάθει συγγνώσεται· τοὺς γὰρ πολλοὺς οὐδ' ἂν πείσαιμι λέγων ἴσως, ὅσοις καὶ ἐν γέλῳτι τὸ πρᾶγμα δοκεῖ, κακῶς διατεθεῖσιν".<sup>5</sup> There is a kind of magnificent mysticism bound up with the dogmatic theology of the Holy Trinity, which inspires the mystical approach to God.<sup>6</sup> On this assumption, theology ("θεολογία"), either as doctrine about God or as method of mystical understanding of His presence through the Incarnation of the Son, is the expression of the relation that exists between God and man, who is "λογικός", creature of God.<sup>7</sup> Of course this entails the existence of (a) particular sources, and (b) a concrete method of interpretation of these sources. According to ST. GREGORY the source of theology is the O.T. and N.T. and the life of the Church, in one word the ecclesiastical tradition,<sup>8</sup> about which the Prophets of the O.T. and the Apostles, the Fathers and the Saints<sup>9</sup> bear witness, who live the Pentecost of the Church in the Holy Spirit.<sup>10</sup> ST. GREGORY uses all the Bible very extensively, especially in order to defend the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, but he insists equally on the unwritten forms of the Church. He combines harmoniously the interpretative methods of the Alexandrian



and Antiochean School, by a 'realisme spirituel',<sup>11</sup> "διασχόντες τὸ  
γράμμα καὶ εἰσω παρακῦψαντες",<sup>12</sup> where he finds the  
"ἀπόθετον κάλλος",<sup>13</sup> namely the Mystery of the Holy  
Trinity.<sup>14</sup>

Of course theology as the study of divine things<sup>15</sup> claims the  
application of a particular method; this was<sup>an</sup> imperative need acknow-  
ledged both by the pagan philosophers and the theologians of the Church,  
a thing which sounds so strangely to modern minds, where, as Prof.  
J. ROMANIDES pointed out, "almost all theologies have been swept away  
together with almost all philosophies by the modern critical mind which  
can no longer allow authority to speculation unless transformed into  
tested axioms which in turn are always left open to further testing  
and modifications".<sup>16</sup> ST. GREGORY is explicit in the Oratio De Pace III;  
having already confessed at the beginning of paragr. 12 the belief in  
the Holy Trinity, he characterizes this "theologia" as "philosophia", on  
which he applied its<sup>particular</sup> method "Ταῦτα ὡς ἐν βραχείσι περιλο-  
σφεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς δογματικῶς, ἀλλ' οὐ κακοπραγμονι-  
κῶς. ἑκκλησιαστικῶς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀγοραίως ὠφελίμως ἀλλ'  
οὐκ ἐπιδεικτικῶς".<sup>17</sup>

It is note worthy that the  
same methodological principles govern the Greek philosophical thought  
of his time. In IAMBlichus we find similar wording: "Τὸ δ' οἰκείον  
ἐπὶ πᾶσι ἀποδώσομέν σοι προσηκόντως, καὶ τὰ μὲν θεολογικὰ θεο-  
λογικῶς, θεουργικῶς δὲ τὰ θεουργικὰ ἀποκρινόμεθα,  
φιλοσόφως δὲ τὰ φιλόσοφα μετὰ σοῦ συνεξετάσομεν".<sup>18</sup>  
On the other hand surely ARISTOTLE would<sup>have</sup> disagreed with ST. GREGORY's  
attribution of the dialectical method (ἀντιλογικῶς) to him, because

[\* ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀντιλογικῶς ἀλιεντικῶς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀριστοτελικῶς πνευματικῶς ]

ARISTOTLE says that it is necessary to approach the different kinds of science with a method of treatment already present in and proper to each, since it is not possible to grasp two things at once; thus mathematics claims a specific method of procedure, which is absolutely abstract.<sup>19</sup> "Τῶν ἀρχῶν δ' αἱ μὲν ἐπαγωγῇ θεωροῦνται, αἱ δ' αἰσθησί, αἱ δ' ἐθισμῶ τινί, καὶ ἄλλαι ἄλλως. Μετέναι δὲ πειρατέον ἐκάστας ἥ περὶ κασιν, καὶ σπουδαστέον ὅπως διορισθῶσι καλῶς".<sup>20</sup>

G. FLOROVSKY explains that the phrase 'in the manner of the Apostles, not in that of Aristotle' reveals the kerygmatic character of Patristic theology which was still at that time a 'message', although it had been articulated under intellectual arguments.<sup>21</sup>

The exclusion of dialectics as a method of Christian "theologia" has a cardinal reason; "Διαλεκτική" as a philosophical method examines "what is" from a three-fold aspect "διαίρετῶς, ὀριστικῶς, ἀναλυτικῶς";<sup>22</sup> or, as PLOTINUS analyses, PLATO'S method of division of species<sup>and</sup> defines the dialectic method: "τῇ διαίρεσει τῇ πλάτωνος χρωμένη μὲν εἰς διάκρισιν τῶν εἰδῶν, χρωμένη δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ τί ἐστί, χρωμένη δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ πρῶτα γένη, καὶ τὰ ἐκ τούτων νοερώς πλέκουσα ἕως ἂν διέλθῃ πᾶν τὸ νοητὸν καὶ ἀνὰ πάλιν ἀναγίνουσα εἰς ὃ ἂν ἐπ' ἀρχὴν ἔλθῃ".<sup>23</sup>

As it comes from this passage, dialectic was the method of understanding the Universe, and of course of the first principles ("τὸ τί ἐστί").

But this presupposed an essentially ontological unity between God and creation, which does not exist in the Christian framework. Thus as H. A. WOLFSON stated, when the Fathers criticized the Arians, who used the method of syllogistic reasoning, they did not conflict only with



misuse of the Aristotelian syllogism, but with the misuse of PLATO'S method of logical division, both of which could have led to fallacious ways.<sup>24</sup>

To face the Arians ST. GREGORY follows methodologically ST. ATHANASIUS; granted that the Arians agreed with the Orthodox Christians about the biblical and patristic tradition,<sup>25</sup> he tries to show that the passages which they isolated from the rest of the scriptural context prove them to be in self-contradiction by bringing against their doctrine many passages from the rest of Scripture.<sup>26</sup> His pure purpose was to make the "theologia" free from empty dialectics in order to 'refer it back to the vision of faith',<sup>27</sup> viz. the Christian life, where Christ is the true theologian.<sup>28</sup> Certainly he does not repudiate reason, but the artificial dialectic ("τεχνολογία"). He wrote to his successor bishop NECTARIUS of Constantinople that the latter was an expert at "τὴν τοῦ ὁρθοῦ λόγου συνηγορίαν",<sup>29</sup> and in another case he describes the reasoning "ὡς λόγου σύντροφος",<sup>30</sup> or he says that the speech which is not governed by "λόγος" is a man-made distortion on that occasion.<sup>31</sup> ST. GREGORY seems to respect man's mind, especially since this is the means by which the communication with God is possible;<sup>32</sup> but finally faith is the fulfilment of every theological argument,<sup>33</sup> and for this reason the theology is mystery, a revelation of God, the Word of whom remains the final criterion, while men's syllogisms are "μεταιότης... καὶ τῆς πίστεως ἀνατροπή, καὶ τοῦ μυστηρίου κένωσις".<sup>34</sup> He uses severe language in order to criticize the philosophical deviousness of discussions conducted by the of Arians, the Eunomians and <sup>the</sup> Macedonians. These latter were called by the ancient

Fathers "τροπικοί" because, as H. N. BATE proved 'they were for every trying to explain Biblical texts as instances of one or other of the "τρόποι" recognized by the rhetoricians, the students of "ἡ ἐν λόγοις τέχνη".<sup>35</sup> On the other hand ST. GREGORY hits at the Eunomian style of argument, which was a trick of Arian logic, <sup>and says</sup> that it is "σκολίων" (of logical traps) and "ὑριφοιδές" (it consists of strings of disjunctive syllogisms).<sup>36</sup> Therefore ST. GREGORY characterizes his <sup>opponents</sup> Arian, or Eunomian, or Pneumatomachians, <sup>speaks of them as</sup> "τεχνολόγος"<sup>37</sup> (technologist), or <sup>speaks of them as</sup> "οἱ ἐν λόγοις κομψοί",<sup>38</sup> who pride themselves on their eloquence, "καὶ χαίροντες ταῖς βεβήλοις κενόφωνίαις, καὶ ἀντιθέσει τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως καὶ ταῖς ... λογομαχίαις".<sup>39</sup> In another passage he speaks of the arguments of the Greeks by which they may affect the soul "τῷ κομψῷ τῶν πλοισμάτων καὶ ταῖς ... λογομαχίαις".<sup>40</sup> It must be noted that at least from <sup>the</sup> religious-theourgical texts, of that time we have the same witness about the misuse of reasoning syllogisms by Greek philosophers. The following apothegm comes from <sup>the</sup> Corpus Hermeticum: "Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ <sup>C</sup> ἑλληνων φιλοσοφία, λόγων φόφος".<sup>41</sup> In the last analysis becomes empty polylogia,<sup>42</sup> because the aforesaid heretics cannot restrain the birthpang ("ᾠδίνᾳ") of their speech,<sup>43</sup> and "κινδυνεύει τεχνύδριον εἶναι τὸ μέγα ἡμῶν μυστήριον",<sup>44</sup> instead of "πιστοῦς ἀντὶ τεχνολόγων, καὶ χριστιανούς ἀνδρῶν νυνδνομάζονται".<sup>45</sup> An example of Eunomian "τεχνολογία" is provided by ST. GREGORY in Or. 29.15, where the heretics conclude by a confusion of premisses with the minor premiss that the "μεῖζον τῇ τοῦ αὐτίου φύσει" is "μεῖζον τῇ φύσει".<sup>46</sup> For ST. GREGORY, beyond the secular wisdom and its

methods, true theology claims a search ' εἰς τῶν ἡμετέρων ὁρῶν ',<sup>47</sup> which means that he intends to develop a particular theological method corresponding to Christian theology.

He does it in the preliminary discourse against the Eunomians, where he defines the function of the "theologian" as philosophizing about God,<sup>48</sup> which is in actuality "true philosophy".<sup>49</sup> Although the term has a variety of meanings, ST. GREGORY uses the term "philosophy" with a contemplative connotation, and as D. F. WINSLOW pointed out, it is<sup>also</sup> connected with the illumination of the rest of the Christians; "when Gregory made the transition (albeit reluctantly) from his solitary retreat to his active role as preacher and pastor, it was a transition which brought the private world of philosophia over into the public realm of theologia".<sup>50</sup> But the task of theology as illumination is not a function of any one;<sup>51</sup> it belongs to those who have prepared by deep study and who have been purified or at least who are being purified. Thus according to ST. GREGORY the theologian is the man who has reached theoria ("θεωρία"), "a term which was used by Christ in relation to the work of the Holy Spirit in leading the Apostles into all the truth";<sup>52</sup> but before this, two spiritual situations must be surpassed, viz. the purification and inactivity ("συχνη").<sup>53</sup> One must engage in long "study" in obedience to the right method in order to reach the truth of the Pentecostal "θεωρία".

At the same time it should be stressed once again that even in the Greek philosophical tradition the problem of the true philosophy and the perfect philosopher represents a similar character. Thus we

read in the Vita of PROCLUS, which had been written by his pupil MARINUS, that PROCLUS followed a strict course of study, beginning with ARISTOTLE and ending with PLATO, until he arrived at pure vision ("ἐποπτεία").<sup>54</sup> This passage deserves a verbatim quotation: "Ἐν ἑτέροι γούν οὔτε δύο ὅλοις πάσας τὰς Ἀριστοτέλους συνανέγνω πραγματείας, λογικάς, ἠθικάς, πολιτικάς, φυσικάς, καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ ταύτας θεολογικὴν ἐπιστήμην. Ἀχθέντα δὲ διὰ τούτων ἱκανῶς, ὥσπερ διὰ τινων προτελείων καὶ μικρῶν μυστηρίων, εἰς τὴν Πλάτωνος ἔγε μυσταγωγίαν, ἐν τᾷ καὶ οὐκ ὑπερβάδμιον πόδα κατὰ τὸ χόριον, τείνοντα, καὶ τὰς παρ' ἐκείνῳ θείας ὄντως τελετὰς ἐποπτεύειν ἐποίει τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς ἀνεπιθοχώτοις ὄμμασι καὶ τῇ τοῦ νοῦ ἀχραντῷ περιωπῇ."<sup>54</sup>

Of course the framework is reminiscent of the religious mysteries, but the meaning is metaphorical; just as in the mysteries, the final stage is the "ἐποπτεία",<sup>55</sup> here it is "ἡ τοῦ νοῦ ἀχραντος περιωπή" that is, through the "προτελεία" of the logical procedure of ARISTOTLE'S works, PROCLUS, according to MARINUS, reached the stage of the pure mind, in which man's spiritual powers are consummated.<sup>55</sup> On the other hand in the Corpus Hermeticum, philosophy is identified with piety and the elevation to God,<sup>56</sup> just as in ST. GREGORY the final goal of the Christian life is the situation of a deified person by his inclination to God ("τῇ πρὸς θεὸν νέσει θεοῦμενον"),<sup>57</sup> about which we will speak of later in this chapter.

The order of theologia claims first of all as prerequisite the purification of the theologian, which is the purification of body and

especially of soul,<sup>58</sup> as the latter is more valuable than the body.

The purification of the soul is the purification of the human reason<sup>59</sup> from its illusions, in order to see the dogmatic truth, and<sup>by</sup> so doing,

to avoid Arianism and Sabellianism. "Ἐκτεμε τὰ σωματικά πά-  
θη, ἔκτεμε καὶ τὰ ψυχικά... Ἐκτεμε τὴν Ἀρειανὴν ἀσέβη-  
αν, ἔκτεμε τὴν Σαβελλίου κακοδοσίαν".<sup>60</sup> The soul which

possesses the dogmatic truth, viz. the Trinitarian dogma, is perfect ("τελεία"), having reached the stage of perfection.<sup>61</sup> For this

reason purification for the Fathers, and for ST. GREGORY in particular always has the Living God as<sup>the ultimate</sup> point of reference. In this sense<sup>is</sup> of a positive character in contrast to Greek philo-  
sophical purification, which is a negative act enabling

the philosopher to become free from the bodily presence.<sup>62</sup> In the Patristic context

ultimate necessity for purification is justified by the fact that God Himself is pure and good;<sup>63</sup> thus if someone likes to be "θεοειδής "

(of God's likeness) he has to be similar to his archetype,<sup>64</sup> because the purification is possible for 'like by like'.<sup>65</sup> Thus ST. GREGORY

refuting PLATO'S statement that "μὴ καθαρῷ γὰρ καθαρὸν ἑφ-  
άπτεσθαι μὴ οὐ θεμιτόν",<sup>66</sup> suggests a moderate expression,

especially by<sup>the</sup> use of the adverb "τυχόν",<sup>67</sup> as follows: "Μὴ καθαρῷ  
γὰρ ἑφάπτεσθαι καθαρὸν τυχόν οὐδὲ ἀσφαλές ",<sup>68</sup>

means that a peril always lies in theological matters. On the other

hand the purification of the Greek mysteries, against which ST. GREGORY apparently argues, is the apotheosis of the human being, arrogant and self-sufficient of his achievements, though of course through a strict

order of practice.<sup>69</sup> In Christian life purification is a

self-sacrifice for the sake of the Living God, who is the absolutely pure entity. "Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καθαρτέον ἑαυτὸν πρῶτον, εἴτα τῷ καθαρῷ προσομιλήσειν".<sup>70</sup>

The purified, or at least the one who is being purified, reaches the stage of inactivity ("συχλή"). We should say that inactivity is the particular state of the purified, which may be defined: (a) as the inner condition of the soul after having separated from the troubles and the events of everyday life, and (b) as retirement from the world and devotion to the ascetic life. In both cases peace and silence characterize the life of the Christian philosopher. Silence for ST. GREGORY is the archetypal situation of man and creation, which recalls the first 'fiat'.<sup>71</sup> For the theologian especially, inactivity and silence are necessary presuppositions before theologizing. "Θεῖ γὰρ τῷ ὄντι συχλάσαι καὶ γινῶναι θεόν. καὶ ὅταν λάβωμεν καιρὸν, κρίνεν θεολογίας ἐκδήντητα".<sup>72</sup> He himself would prefer silence for ever, if he did not feel responsible for speaking in order to refute heretical doctrines. When he breaks his silence he does it carefully and by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.<sup>73</sup> ST. GREGORY himself wishes to teach nothing of his own,<sup>74</sup> but only that which the Holy Spirit illuminates him to express. This is a common locus for the Greek Fathers; in actuality it is the imperative claim for objectivity, for the absolute objectivity which is only God, the Holy Spirit, in Whom we have the possibility of knowing the uncreated energies of the Holy Trinity through the Holy Economy.<sup>75</sup>



Thus the theologian, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, proceeds to the third stage, inside the divine cloud ("γνόφος"), where he obtains the knowledge of the boundlessness of God and the power of the divine mystery of theology. ST. GREGORY explains that this is possible by participation of the image, viz. the man, into its archetypon, viz. God. "Εὐφρήσει δέ... ἐπειδ' ἂν τὸ θεοειδὲς τοῦτο καὶ θεῖον, λέγω δὲ τὸν ἡμέτερον νοῦν τε καὶ λόγον, τῷ οἰκείῳ προσμίξῃ, καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν ἀνέλθῃ πρὸς τὸ ἀρχέτυπον, οὗ νῦν ἔχει τὴν ἕξασιν".<sup>76</sup> At this situation man ceases to have a will of his own, but he is inspired ("ἐνεργουμένος"), as previously the Prophets were inspired; but neither the Prophets nor their successors, viz. the Apostles and the Fathers, saw or proclaimed the nature of God.<sup>77</sup> ST. GREGORY talks about himself, that is, <sup>that</sup> he had the same experience with that one of the Prophets, Apostles and the Holy Fathers;<sup>78</sup> and as J. ROMANIDES points out, this means that the revelation of God is "not only in the distant past but a present reality",<sup>79</sup> and should be understood in terms of the Pentecostal experience "in which revelation and understanding are identical".<sup>80</sup> So, all who have the same experience are united to each other in the glory of the Holy Trinity who keep the assumed humanity of Christ; they have therefore the same knowledge of the glory of God and for this reason the same theology,<sup>81</sup> viz. the same theoria.<sup>82</sup> On the other hand the theoria is the state of the deified mind, because for ST. GREGORY the participation in the divine life is possible <sup>only through</sup> the mind; for this reason purification of mind is a presupposition to theoria.<sup>83</sup> which however is subject to illumination stemming from God. ST. GREGORY does not deny reason, but interprets it together with theoria <sup>and</sup> makes it the means for Christian belief, as a single way to salvation, which retains its identity from the first beginning to the

present, and for ever" Οὕτω καὶ μία τις ἦν σωτηρίας ὁδός, ἡ διὰ λόγον καὶ θεωρίας.<sup>84</sup>

Thus, as J. ROMANIDES pointed out in his excellent treatise, to which we have already referred previously, the Fathers explain that the Fall was "the darkening of the "νοῦς" of Adam and his descendants",<sup>85</sup> as it was enslaved to the intellect ("διάνοια"), and lost the communion with the Logos, because it lost the unceasing prayer to God ("εὐχή"), under the thought that Adam himself might be god.

On these assumptions ST. GREGORY speaks about Adam's life in Paradise being simple and inartificial, since Adam symbolically was tilling the immortal plants, "Θείων ἑννοιῶν ὅσως" (perhaps the Divine Conceptions).<sup>86</sup> So the Tree of Knowledge was not evil from the beginning nor <sup>did</sup> God forbid us to touch it because of envy; "ἀλλὰ καλὸν μὲν εὐκαίρως μεταλαμβάνόμενον", since for ST. GREGORY it was theoria, "ἥς μόνοις ἐπιβαίνειν ἀσφαλές τοῖς τὴν ἔξιν τελεωτέροις, οὐ καλὸν δὲ τοῖς ἀσφλουτέροις ἔτι, καὶ τὴν ἔφεσιν λιχνοτέροις, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τροφὴν τελείαν λισιτελής τοῖς ἀπλοῖς ἔτι κδεομένοις γάλακτος".<sup>87</sup> This statement brings us

back to the preliminary discourse against the Eunomians, where ST. GREGORY defines the subject of theology (as true philosophy) and specifies <sup>(restrictive)</sup> the extent to which we may philosophize. The answer is severe <sup>and</sup> we may philosophize (a) only "ὅσα ἡμῖν ἐφικτά",<sup>88</sup> and (b), to such an extent as the spiritual power of the audience may allow in order to avoid the danger of a fall, either on the part of the spiritual leader or of the



congregation, since there are three elements in which someone might fail : " νοῦν , ἢ λόγον , ἢ ἀκοήν , ἐν τρισὶ τούτοις τοῦ κινδύνου σαλεύοντος " .<sup>89</sup> Therefore there is an order for everything and everyone, which, according to ST. GREGORY, does not mean that it is not needful to remember God at all times,<sup>90</sup> but <sup>that</sup> we must speak of Him at a convenient time<sup>91</sup> and with measure<sup>92</sup> and under the leadership of the Holy Spirit: " Τὰ δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος, παρέστω μοι τὸ Πνεῦμα , καὶ διδόντω λόγον , ὅσον καὶ βούλομαι· εἰ δὲ μὴ τοσοῦτον, ἀλλ' ὅσος ᾖ τῷ καιρῷ σύμμετρος " .<sup>93</sup> He stresses furthermore that we ought to think of God than to breathe, viz. we must make God the centre of our life.<sup>94</sup> J. ROMANIDES speaks about the unceasing prayer as the element which unifies the three stages of the spiritual life of the theologian.<sup>95</sup>

It is note-worthy that we find the same approach in Greek texts, beginning with the Orphic poetry; from PROCLUS comes the following comment which is reminiscent of ST. GREGORY'S language: " Καὶ χρὴ ἀδιαλείπτως ἔχεισθαι τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον θρησκευίας·

Διδύνοντι γὰρ θεσπῶ κραπνοὶ μάκαρες τελέθουσι" <sup>96</sup>

And the justification belongs to another Neoplatonist

JAMBLICHUS, who claims that in what he is about to write he is inspired by god: " Οὐδὲ λόγον περὶ θεῶν ἄνευ θεῶν λαλεῖν δυνατόν " .<sup>97</sup> On the other hand the author of <sup>the</sup> Oracula Chaldaica prompts

the philosophers <sup>cate his</sup> ~~not to communicate~~ to the common people because they are not purified.<sup>98</sup> For the philosophers also purification refers especially to the mind ("νοῦς"), since only mind " may conceive the truth! " ὁ δὲ νοῦς μέγας ἔστι, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου μέχρι τινὸς ὀδηγηθεὶς, φθάνει

μέχρι τῆς ἀληθείας ".<sup>99</sup> DIOGENES LAERTIUS in his De Clarorum Philosophorum Vitis, attributes to PLATO the classification of the pre-suppositions for the right reasoning, which is similar to the texture and content of paragr. 3 of the Or. 27, thus: " τὸ ὁρθῶς λέγειν διαιρεῖται εἰς τέσσαρα· ἐν μὲν ᾧ δεῖ λέγειν, δεύτερον δὲ ὅσα δεῖ λέγειν, τρίτον πρὸς οὓς δεῖ λέγειν, τέταρτον δὲ πυνίκα δεῖ λέγειν ".<sup>100</sup>

Of course that which is different, between the philosophers and ST. GREGORY, is the final goal of their respective philosophies.

Opposing the abstract deity of the philosophers ST. GREGORY writes his magnum opus, The Five Theol. Orations, in defence of the Church's dogma (against Eunomians and Macedonians). In the beginning of the second (theological oration) he says that the last four orations are " τῆς θεολογίας λόγοι ",<sup>101</sup> - which earned him the title, 'the theologian'. Furthermore ST. GREGORY states that theology, (theologia) refers to the Persons of the Holy Trinity,<sup>102</sup> or, as he notes in another passage, theology is logos about God, viz. logos which defends the simplicity (essence) and the triplicity (the divinity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit) of God.<sup>103</sup> At any rate, as CH. N. BOUKES proved, on the basis of ST. GREGORY'S works, the latter believes that the Christians may have the possibility to know some additional aspects of the mystery of the Holy Trinity than the knowledge of the already formulated dogma, which must be interpreted as a special illumination to the purified theologian, given now or in the coming life.<sup>104</sup> " Καὶ οὗτος ἀριστος ἡμῶν θεολόγος, οὐχ ὅς ἐστι τὸ πᾶν... ἀλλ' ὅς ἐστιν ἀλλου φαντασθῆναι πλεον καὶ πλείον ἐν ἑαυτῷ συναγάγει τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας ἵνδαγμα ἢ ἀποσκίασμα. " <sup>105</sup>

But this task is not useful to everyone, as we have already examined.

For ST. GREGORY it is necessary for everyone to confess and to believe in Jesus Christ that He has risen from ~~the~~ dead, viz. that He is God, and under this confession everyone may be saved.

This last point introduces us to the so called theme of the Holy Economy,<sup>106</sup> the content of which is the incarnation of the Son and the soteriological presuppositions of man's salvation.<sup>107</sup> Of course all the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity function<sup>108</sup> in the mystery of the Divine Dispensation, and upon this basis the Christian may, through Christ in the Holy Spirit, theologize properly within the ecclesiastical order and obedience.<sup>109</sup> In turn, we will try to elucidate some neglected aspects of the trinitarian dogma according to <sup>the</sup> theologian par excellence ST. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS.

## CHAPTER II

### THE REVELATION OF GOD - THE DIVINE NAMES

On the assumption of the distinction which we have already explained in the previous chapter, viz. that "θεολογία" and "οἰκονομία" represent two achievements for man's salvation, the Revelation of the Holy Trinity, communicated through the mystery of the Holy Economy, is actually the "ἄκρα" condescension of God to human weakness, and the greatest act of love, as "ἐνυπόστατος" philanthropy.

After the original sin, Adam although deprived of his blessed life, preserved the memory of the divine presence.<sup>1</sup> In this condition man's mind firstly attempted to conceive of an idea of the deity through the order of material creation, which is the impression of the "fingers" of God;<sup>2</sup> this is what ST. GREGORY calls 'natural proofs' ("φυσικαὶ ἀποδείξεις").<sup>3</sup> Nature and human history constitute the starting-point in the knowledge of God.<sup>4</sup> Thus in the Pagan world the philosopher is elevated to the cause of entia looking upon creation which always remains in harmony, and bears witness to a 'maker' of the entire kosmos, one and only one, who keeps every cosmological element in order. This theory is a common locus both in the Greek tradition and the christian one; but whereas in the Greek tradition the ascent ("ἀναγωγή") from the effects ("ἀτιατά") to the cause ("ἀιτιον")<sup>5</sup> is the prerequisite for a plausible interpretation of the Universe, in the biblical tradition on the other hand the perceptible world reflects

only the presence of God, not His essence:  
 "Ἡλίκα δέ... ἡ ἀνὴρ τις ὀλίγη τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ παρ-  
 ουσίαν, καὶ τὰντα οὐ φύσιν, ἐσκιαγράφησεν".<sup>6</sup> Furthermore for the  
 philosopher, the ascent ("ἀναγωγή") is a sacrifice itself, a  
 spiritual sacrifice at the highest level,<sup>7</sup> whereas ST. GREGORY talks  
 about the "λόγος" (the reason), which was created by God, "καὶ πᾶσι  
 σύμφυτος καὶ πρῶτος ἐν ἡμῖν νόμος καὶ πᾶσι συνημμένος".<sup>8</sup>  
 as that which elevates us up to God; that means that in  
 Christian belief the visible world plays only a paedagogic role.<sup>9</sup>

In general the formulation of this theory is indebted to the  
 Apologists who compromised biblical monotheism with the ultimate Cause  
 of the Philosophers emphasizing that the existence of God was inferred,  
 (a) from the motion of the Universe,<sup>10</sup> (b) from the existence of mutable  
 things which points to an immutable Creator,<sup>11</sup> (c) from the design of  
 the Universe,<sup>12</sup> "διὰ τῶν ὁραμένων καὶ τεταγμένων".<sup>13</sup>  
 According to ST. GREGORY, following the Greek philosophical tradition,  
 these lead to the "πάντων ποιητικὴ καὶ συνεκτικὴ αἰτία",<sup>14</sup>  
 which is not subject to motion and space. This is the reason, as we  
 will see in turn, that his main problem was to define the distinction  
 between the existence and the essence of God, in fact to define the  
 theological principles of positive and negative theology. On the other  
 hand ST. GREGORY, like all the Fathers before and after him till the  
 fifteenth century, had to face simultaneously the philosophical question  
 about "ὁποία" is the essence of deity, according to philosophical  
 principles which PLATO and ARISTOTLE had put as prerequisites for the  
 study of the "ὅντως ὄν".<sup>15</sup>

On this point at issue the problem of a possible knowledge of God is faced by ST. GREGORY in relation with faith "πίστις".<sup>16</sup> First of all when we talk about a knowledge of God, it must be stressed that 'we shall know as we are known'.<sup>17</sup> From this aspect ST. GREGORY follows the lines of ST. PAUL'S theology, although the idea occurs also in the Corpus Hermeticum, a selection of religious and philosophical texts with a preponderance of loan-passages and words from the Christian tradition.<sup>18</sup> Thus the supernatural revelation endows man with the highest knowledge, as the weakness of the human mind is reinforced by the "πίστις", which is the fulfilment of the human "λόγος".<sup>19</sup> In another passage ST. GREGORY makes an indirect hint against philosophy suggesting to Christians that they should surpass even their "λόγος" by causing their faith to lead <sup>them</sup> "πίστις δὲ ἀγέτω πλέον ἡμᾶς ἢ λόγος, εἴπερ ἔμαθες τὸ ἀσθενὲς ἐν τοῖς ἑγγυτέρω, καὶ λόγον ἔγνωσ, τῷ γινῶναι τὰ ὑπὲρ λόγον, ἵνα μὴ παντελῶς ἐπίγειος ᾖ, ἢ περίγειος, ἀγνοῶν καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο, τὴν ἀγνοίαν".<sup>20</sup> Of course ST. GREGORY admits that the most perfect of "ὄντα" is the knowledge of God, which, however, <sup>one</sup> might obtain as knowledge of illumination "ἐλλαμψις" of the Holy Trinity, although he is cautious to assert that it is not possible to have a perfect knowledge even of this illumination: "ἢ τις ἑορτῇ, καὶ οἶα, καὶ ὅση".<sup>21</sup> In addition, the confession of the Holy Trinity, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit is the deepest knowledge ("ἐπίγνωσις"),<sup>22</sup> which is attained "ἐπειδὴ τὸ θεοειδὲς τοῦτο καὶ θεῖον, λέγω δὲ τὸν ἡμέτερον νοῦν τε καὶ λόγον, τῷ οἰκείῳ προσμίζῃ, καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν ἀνέλθῃ πρὸς τὸ ἀρχέτυπον".<sup>23</sup> The general phraseology of this passage is similar to that of two



passages of the Corpus Hermeticum, but the result is different; the philosopher alleges that by "νοῦς" and "λόγος" we can reach the truth,<sup>24</sup> since the "νοῦς" in man is a god, while the Christian theologian obtains only a relative knowledge of the mysteries of God. ST. GREGORY refuses to describe either the essence of God or the mode of existence of His Hypostaseis. "Εἰπέ σὺ (ST. GREGORY addresses his supposed disputant) τὴν ἀγεννησίαν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ γὰρ τὴν γέννησιν τοῦ υἱοῦ ζησιολογήσω, καὶ τὴν ἐκπόρευσιν τοῦ Πνεύματος καὶ παραπληκτίσωμεν ἄμφω εἰς θεοῦ μυστήρια παρακύντοντες".<sup>25</sup> An attempt of such a kind would be a reaction of mad people : an ontological suicide.<sup>26</sup>

Although the Fathers adopted sometimes, after a careful analysis, philosophical terminology, nevertheless they were always devoted to the biblical tradition as the point of departure centered on the living personal God of the Holy Economy, and not <sup>on</sup> an abstract philosophical principle. So, ST. GREGORY, when he talks about the simplicity of the substance of God, simultaneously states the hypostatical distinction of the Persons, which does not detract from the simplicity of divine substance and safeguards the biblical tradition. In this framework the so called theology of unions and distinctions in <sup>the</sup> Godhead might be imposed,<sup>27</sup> in the sense that they preserve the trinitarian mystery as a subject of human confusion of mind, side by side with creation, as the nature of God is unutterable ("ἄρρητος") and above and beyond the "λόγος",<sup>28</sup> as He is all, like some <sup>boundless</sup> Sea of Being "ἄπειρος καὶ ἄοριστος" (limitless and unbounded).<sup>29</sup> It is noteworthy that the "κρίματα" of God, viz. His energies, are characterized by a

similar phraseology. ST. GREGORY speaks for ST. PAUL who tried to arrive at the judgements ("κρίματα") of God, but does not find any way out ("διδόχον"); "ἐκπλήθει (with astonishment) περιγράφει τὸν λόγον, καὶ πλουτὸν θεοῦ, καὶ βάθος τὸ τοιοῦτο καλεῖ, καὶ ὁμολογεῖ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ κριμάτων τὸ ἀκατάληπτον".<sup>30</sup>

The adjective "ἀκατάληπτος" is well known to have been used by the Fathers in order to express in some way the absolute incomprehensibility of the essence of God.<sup>31</sup> Furthermore the "ἀκατάληπτον" of God and His energies ("κρίματα") is applied to the O.T. as well, where David was subject to the same experience as ST. PAUL (ST. GREGORY confesses that he had a similar experience).<sup>32</sup> Again the judgements of God are described as "ἄβυσσος" (great profundity or abyss),<sup>33</sup> and else - where the discussion is about the "βάθος" (depths) of God.<sup>34</sup> At this point one is reminded of the "χώρα" or "τόπος" of Platonic ideas (region of gods), or the "τόπος εἰδῶν" of ARISTOTLE. Of course it is of more importance that God was frequently called 'place' by the Jews.<sup>35</sup> The word magom (place) is applied to God for he produces all, determines all, and bounds all. It is indisputable that PHILO, the Jewish Philosopher, is the link between the two traditions, viz. the Greek and <sup>the</sup> biblical ; he calls God "τόπος" and "χώρα" as well.<sup>36</sup> Coming back to Patristic tradition the Platonic "χώρα" and the Aristotelian "τόπος εἰδῶν" became "βάθος"<sup>37</sup> in CLEMENT of Alexandria, while later on, ORIGEN could not find any word to express symbolically even God, since He is beyond everything.<sup>38</sup> CLEMENT moves on the same lines when, purely in middle platonic language, he comes to the conclusion that he has denied any knowledge even of that



particular one of the qualities of God. He says that only by means of the Incarnation man may have a knowledge of God, but " οὐδ' ἔστιν, οὐδὲ μὴ ἔστι γινώσκοντες ".<sup>39</sup> MAKARIUS the Egyptian comes back to Alexandrian terminology by saying that God is the "πέλαγος",<sup>40</sup> as ST. GREGORY says, and later ST. GREGORY PALAMAS talks about the 'Abyss of grace' of God following ST. GREGORY,<sup>41</sup> ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA and the Areopagetica

Side by side with the Christian tradition of the Alexandrian School, (and we speak of an Alexandrian tradition having assumed firstly a kind of silent agreement between the Greek philosophers and the theologians of the Alexandrian School on a peaceful coexistence of both sides) there is the pure pagan tradition where the theory about the "τόπος" and "χώρα" sounds Platonic or Aristotelian tendencies with PROCLUS as representative of the reconciliation between the two main Greek traditions,<sup>42</sup> while we might also mention the long tradition of Orphic Poetry,<sup>the</sup> Corpus Hermeticum,<sup>the</sup> Oracula Chaldaica and a variety of Gnostic texts.<sup>43</sup>

But what is the meaning of all these common loci for ST. GREGORY'S theology, especially in the case where he tries to apply traditional criteria to criticizing new and old heresies which disturbed the life of the Church? As we have already mentioned, he centralizes his attention first of all on an exact distinction between the existence ("ὕπαρξις") and the essence ("οὐσία") of God. In fact the methodology at this point is identical with that of Pagan philosophers, from Plato to Iamblichus, about whom DAMASCIUS reports that they have

made a distinction between "εἶναι" and "ὑπάρχειν",<sup>44</sup> but their purpose is surely different. According to ST. GREGORY'S constant affirmation, as the essence or nature of God is incomprehensible, man can only affirm for certain that God exists, as "πλείστον γὰρ διαφέρει τοῦ εἶναι τι πεπεισθαι, τὸ τί ποτέ ἐστι τοῦτο εἰδέναι".<sup>45</sup> In so doing he excludes any possibility for man to conceive the pure essence of God which is unknown even to angels, although they are close to God. The argument is indisputably a criticism of PLATO'S Timaeus<sup>46</sup> to which he refers precisely at the beginning of the same paragraph IV of Oratio 28. Thus ST. GREGORY corrects the Platonic passage from<sup>the</sup> Timaeus, 28C "Τὸν μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ παντὸς εὖρεῖν τὸ ἔρχον, καὶ εὐρόντα εἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λέγειν" - in which PLATO insinuates that he has formed some idea of God - although he agrees with the second part of PLATO'S conclusion by using an alternative wording "φράσαι ἀδύνατον". In his opinion the description of God is impossible, but the conception of God is absolutely unachievable and not only "χαλεπὸν", which might mean a way out for the Philosopher to escape the conviction of ignorance of the "οὐσία" of the "ὄντως ὄν".

The text of Plato in question occurs in the Middle Platonists from ALBINUS, ATTICUS, APULEIUS, to CELSUS. On the other hand, as J. DANIELOU pointed out,<sup>47</sup> the text has been used by Christian writers, after JUSTIN, who was a Middle Platonist, and they cite it in a slightly different form.<sup>48</sup> In the third century the author of the COHORTATIO cites the Hermetic form, which is based upon the Platonic contrast between "τὸ νοητὸν" and "αἰσθητόν",<sup>49</sup> as: "θεὸν νοῆσαι

μέν ἐστι χαλεπὸν, φράσαι δὲ ἄδύνατον ἔσθαι καὶ νοῆσαι δυνατόν",<sup>50</sup>  
 which is close to ST. GREGORY'S phraseology, especially the usage of  
 the infinitives "φράσαι" and "νοῆσαι".

In speaking of this Platonic passage the very first point to  
 be noted is the identification of the Creator with the supreme God,  
 by the Middle Platonists, a notion which is non-existent in PLATO, who  
 distinguishes the Demiurge from the Good. CLEMENT cites the passage  
 several times, in order (a) to express the incomprehensibility of God,  
 after trying to interpret PLATO in terms of the biblical revelation,<sup>51</sup> and  
 (b) to allege that PLATO teaches the creation of the world ex nihilo.<sup>52</sup>  
 Certainly from this passage derives the expression "Πατὴρ καὶ  
 Δημιουργός", which the Apologists used, although it was not a biblical  
 one.<sup>53</sup> On the other hand ORIGEN sees the passage as an example of the  
 contrast between the Christian belief in Christ who reveals the  
 Father and Creator of this Universe, and Platonism, which is based upon  
 intellectual and human effort.<sup>54</sup> As a result of this investigation  
 into passage 28C of <sup>the</sup> Timaeus and its citation in Platonic and Christian  
 tradition, the conclusion emerges that ST. GREGORY inclines to accept  
 ORIGEN'S interpretation rather than that of the Apologists' line,  
 although he always preserves a personal character of thought and  
 criticism; he knows the reverence due to everything good in the Pagan  
 world but without becoming a slave to it.

Thus, although he acknowledges that only the human mind can form  
 an idea about God, when it <sup>is able to</sup> "ἐκβῆναι τὰ σωματικά... καὶ γυμνοῖς  
 ὁμιλῆσαι τοῖς ἄσώματοις",<sup>55</sup> nevertheless he stresses that

there is nothing of the created world, either the perceptible or noetic one, which might illustrate the reality of God, who is "ἐπέκεινα πάντων" 56

In fact, the general drift of this argument was known in the Greek tradition as well; according to ALBINUS God is neither a species nor a genus, nor a part or a whole which consists of parts. He says that anyone can conceive him by abstraction or through analogy, and he admits of no doubt that the theory of subordination helped him in this distinction. Similarly PLOTINUS achieved a kind of philosophical apophaticism claiming that the deity is "ἐπέκεινα τοῦ ὄντος" (beyond the being).<sup>57</sup> The word "ἐπέκεινα" was in common use among the later Platonists; they got it from "ἐπὶ ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας" in PLAT Rep. V. 509B and used it in speaking of "τὸ ἐν", which is beyond, above, or 'prior (= πρόον) to "νοῦς" and "τὰ νοητά" (viz. "τὰ ὄντως ὄντα").

We cannot say how much ST. GREGORY has been influenced by Platonic mysticism at this point, but surely his problem is of an ecclesiastical necessity. Although God is "παντὸν ἐπέκεινα", although there is no illustration to describe His essence, although ST. GREGORY characterizes the attempt for conceiving the nature of God as something profane and vain,<sup>58</sup> nevertheless he was involved in the Pneumatomachian controversy, which led him to withdraw thus to a certain extent the apophatic character of theology. He always feels obliged to soften the contraries, to confess the weakness, to explain his feelings. Of course, the interpretation of a fact which is in relation to his personal responsibility,

positively or negatively alike, may have arisen from his<sup>own</sup> personal understanding. ST. GREGORY talked a lot of his personal participation in the ecclesiastical life,<sup>59</sup> although he admits that he would prefer silence. He sees specifically in the preaching of churchmen the necessity to distinguish orthodox belief from heresy. Thus we should speak of the paedagogic character of theology.<sup>60</sup>

Modern scholars have recently discussed, without any accomplished result, whether we can consider ST. GREGORY as a forerunner of the theory of 'Analogia entis'. Of them J. PLAGNIEUX<sup>61</sup> asserts without any hesitation that ST. GREGORY uses illustrations borrowed from the created world in order to express the essence of God and Trinitarian relations as well, while S. PAPADOPOULOS,<sup>62</sup> rather inclining towards the so called theory of 'Analogia Fidei', dismisses J. PLAGNIEUX'S discussion entirely. EVDOKIMOV'S interpretation seems<sup>to be</sup> more objective; "ST. GREGORY Nazianzus did not apply analogy as the method of his theological thought, but put away all illustrations, which according to him could never interpret entirely the Mystery of God but cause confusion".<sup>63</sup> Although this point will be developed later in chapter VI, we can say here that ST. GREGORY in Or. 31.7 and 11 opposes strongly Pneumatomachian - Arian views, and is obliged to deal with the argumentation of the heretics. J. PLAGNIEUX and S. PAPADOPOULOS have applied modern methods to ST. GREGORY'S texts, which had been written for a concrete purpose, but nevertheless following the existing theological methods. On this assumption, ST. GREGORY, as we can extract from his work, prefers to show the meaning of the so called Names of God, than to describe the essence of God or the relations of the Three Hypostaseis with illustrations.<sup>64</sup>

Let us see in turn how ST. GREGORY justifies the use of the Names of God in the Christian tradition, which are they and how he understands them.

At the end of paragr. 16 of the fourth theol. Oration ST. GREGORY notes that the Christian must not pass over the appellations of the Son ("προσηγορίαι") "πολλὰς τε οὐσὰς καὶ κατὰ πολλῶν κειμένας τῶν περὶ αὐτοῦ νοουμένων", but he has to find the meaning of each of them ("ὅτι ποτε βούλεται παραστήσαι") and prove the mystical meaning of the names,<sup>65</sup> whereas in another passage, after having explained the Names of the Holy Spirit, he regards them as <sup>being</sup> very important and vivid "τοσαῦται καὶ οὕτως ἐμψυχολοί".<sup>66</sup> We must stress the fact that when ST. GREGORY talks about the study of divine Names, he excludes the Platonic method of dividing into species, or the Aristotelian one<sup>67</sup> of "ποσάχως", viz. in how many different senses one word is used in a text because he is devoted to the ecclesiastical method of the mystical meaning of name. Certainly ST. GREGORY follows the previous Christian tradition and he seems to have taken into account ORIGEN'S discussion with Celsus in chap. 24-26 of his Contra Celsum treatise. In the same way, ORIGEN thinks that the usage of a divine Name is connected with an ineffable theology ("ἐπὶ τινος θεολογίας ἀπορρήτου");<sup>68</sup> every name manifests a certain power.<sup>69</sup> This is a common locus for the Middle Eastern nations of the ancient world, especially in the practice of theurgy, including the Jewish nation as well. Later on this idea has been developed more by the Neoplatonists who combine this particular tendency within the Platonic tradition with a typical application



to theurgical works. To be *specific*, these nations believed that as every name is of a particular meaning and power it loses its efficacy if translated into another language. So, ORIGEN witnesses that "οἱ περὶ τὴν χρῆσιν τῶν ἑπωδῶν δεινοί"<sup>70</sup>, viz. the learned men among the Persian magi and some Indian philosophers and the Egyptian wise men,<sup>71</sup> assert (claim) that the charms ("ἑπωδαί") are effective only in their native language. The same principle occurs in <sup>the</sup> Oracula Chaldaica, according to which the "ὀνόματα ἑάρθαρα" must not be translated into Greek, for two reasons; (a) The Gods have explained that this precept was necessary; (b) There is a reason of piety, viz. some "χαρακτῆρες" appear as meaningless to us.<sup>72</sup> ORIGEN, whom

ST. GREGORY follows exactly at this point, says furthermore that the qualities and characteristics of the sounds have an effective power which corresponds to the things.<sup>73</sup> Thus, ST. GREGORY refutes the name 'Galilean' instead of Christian which was introduced by

JULIAN: "Γαλιλαίους ἀντὶ χριστιανῶν ὀνομάσας καὶ καχεῖσθαι νομοθετήσας ἔργῳ δηλῶν, ὅτι μέγιστον εἰς δοῖαν καὶ τιμιώτατον ἢ τοῦ χριστοῦ κλήσις, ἐξ ᾧ ἀποστέρησθαι τάντης ἡμᾶς ἐπενόησεν ἢ φοβούμενάς γε τὴν δύναμιν τῆς προσηγορίας ὥσπερ οἱ δαίμονες."<sup>74</sup>

According to CLEMENT OF ALEX. the bread and the oil are sanctified under the power of the name and so, after the sanctification they are not the same as those which had been assumed, but they have been changed by spiritual power (δυνάμει).<sup>75</sup> Similarly in the Pagan world the evocation of the name was the effective power as in the

following Hymnus Magicus: "Ὁρκίζω τὰ ἅγια καὶ θεῖα ὀνόματα ταῦτα, ὅπως ἂν πέμψωσί μοι τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα καὶ τέλεσθαι ἃ ἔχω κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμὸν."<sup>76</sup>

We can speak of a hypostasization of the name, as prolongation of the 'fiat'. It is very important that we find almost the same interpretation about the origin of the names in the biblical and the ancient world too; according to Genesis<sup>77</sup> Adam named the things "λόγῳ", viz. with his divine element. In PHILO<sup>78</sup>, Adam, as mind, gives the names to things, an idea in common with the philosophical tradition where the philosophers, who have been elevated to the level of pure mind, are the "ὀνοματοδέται",<sup>79</sup> since they know "τὰ ὄντως ὄντα". To conclude our argument for the meaning of a name or the evocation of it, we can say that they reflect that belief in which wording and content of speech were considered essentially as unseparated realities. On this assumption, what is the meaning of the so called 'Appellations of God' who is above any definition of man's mind as He is prior to everything?

ST. GREGORY discusses this point in detail especially in three successive paragraphs of the fourth theol. oration, and occasionally in many other passages in his Corpus.

"Ἀρκετόν δὲ ἡμῖν ἐντεῖνθεν " ST. GREGORY says;<sup>80</sup> the Deity can have no name, viz. cannot be expressed in words. It is noteworthy that in this general premise ST. GREGORY uses the neuter form "δεῖον" instead of "θεός" or "θεότης" which he uses only for the Christian God as we will see below. This usage is justified from the following text, where, surely by the word "οἱ λογισμοί" the Greek philosophical achievements are meant, while on the other hand he refers (Philo). clearly to the Jewish tradition as well. It is somewhat strange that



ST. GREGORY is in a hurry to deal only with the biblical aspect in some detail, although in turn he sounds like a Greek philosopher. Thus, the wisest and most ancient of Jews honoured the "θεῖον" with peculiar characters, meaning the "τετραγράμματος ἱερόν", as we will see later. I think A. J. MASON is in the wrong, as he has misunderstood ST. GREGORY'S particular point; he sees a confusion of ST. GREGORY'S in the phrase "χαρακτήρουν ἱδίοις", saying "while it is well known that the Jews never pronounced the name, there seems to be ground for saying that it was written in a peculiar script".<sup>81</sup> That by the "χαρακτήρουν ἱδίοις" the "τετραγράμματος" is indicated, is obvious from what comes after it, viz. that Jews had never written the name of God with those letters. We have a parallel witness by JOSEPHUS<sup>82</sup> and another one by CLEMENT OF ALEX. about the symbolic philosophy which Moses had been taught by the learned men of Egypt "ὅν ἐν τοῖς λεγομένοις ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν (ἐν τοῖς ἱεροχρυσεῖοις γράμμασιν) ἐπιδείκνυνται".<sup>83</sup> ST. BASIL also bears a similar witness, but where ST. GREGORY uses the word "χαρακτήρ", he has an alternative sc. "σημεῖον" (sign), while the phraseology remains pretty much the same.<sup>84</sup> Of course the final result issued from this representation underscores peremptorily the absolute preponderance of the Deity "ὡς δέον ἀκοινώνητον εἶναι ... τὸ θεῖον τοῖς ἡμετέροις".<sup>85</sup> This idea saturates the next part of paragr. 17, in which the discussion is attuned to the philosophical fashion of inquiry into first principles. The argument is addressed exactly to Pneumatomachians, and ST. GREGORY is refuting particularly their illustrations which are borrowed from the created world for expressing the reality of God; he asks rhetorically: "πότε ἂν δέξαιντο λυομένη φωνῇ τὴν ἀχρυστον ἐν-

σιν καὶ ἰδιδάζουσιν ";<sup>86</sup> the answer comes from his own question; neither a mind nor a speech could illustrate the essence of God, thus the Deity is "ἀκατονόμαστον". Although I think that ST. GREGORY with the phrase "ὅντε ... νοῦς ἑχωρήσεν" makes an allusion to Platonic philosophers, nevertheless we must stress the fact that Greeks, as ST. GREGORY himself has already admitted, throughout this reasoning achievements could conceive the idea that God is beyond any name. Apart from the Orphic Poetry and the Corpus of Chaldaica and Hermetica, the theme has been discussed by PLATO, and later within the Neoplatonic tradition. PLATO (in Parmenides) talks about the ultimate One thus: "οὐδ' ὀνομάζεται ἄρα οὐδὲ λέγεται, οὐδὲ δοῖσάσεται, οὐδὲ γινώσεται, οὐδέ τι τῶν ὄντων αὐτοῦ ἀποδάνεται",<sup>87</sup> and this passage occurs over and over again until the very last diadochus of the Academia.<sup>88</sup> In fact the justification is based upon the sensible theory that if a name might have described God, then God would be subject to this or at least younger than it, but as God is "ἀγέννητος" (unbegotten) no name can express this essence: "πρεσβύτερον ἔχει, τὸν θεμένον τὸ ὄνομα".<sup>89</sup> But the problem remains, viz. what is the meaning and the origin of the appellations, which either the biblical or the extra-biblical sources used in order to name the Deity?

ST. GREGORY gives a laconic reply and once more refers to the vocation of the best theologian, a thing that underlines his reluctance to explain dogmatics entirely. We must analyse his reply, especially in comparison with Christian and pagan texts of a parallel nuance. He says that, although no name can explain the Deity, we can however sketch

means of  
Him by Attributes, viz. by certain facts that are in connection with Him and known to us, from which we obtain a faint and feeble idea about Him, but not a precise one " ἅλην ἀπ' ἁλλου ". This last phrase corresponds to " τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας ἰνδαλμα, ἢ ἀποσκιάσμα, ἢ ὅ,τι καὶ ὀνομάσομεν " with which paragraph 17 ends. Let us now see in detail which are " τὰ περὶ αὐτόν " and " τὰ κατ' αὐτόν ". The 'more' of the excellent theologian is not the 'all' but an image or a radiance of a great light; namely, this is not a direct revelation of the divine essence itself, but a manifestation of the presence of God through His energies. Thus JUSTIN says that the " προσρήσεις " (names) come from His benefits and works (sc. energies).<sup>90</sup> P. EVDOKIMOV is of the same mind in saying that positive theology is described by the Fathers as 'symbolic', because it is related only to the attributes of God within the Revelation or His manifestations in the created world.<sup>91</sup>

Furthermore, PROCOPIUS is more explicit in his comment on Exod. 16, 23. " Ἔθος τῇ Γραφῇ τὰ ἀποτελέσματα τῶν ἔργων καλεῖν τοῖς ὀνόμασι τῶν ἀγίων ",<sup>92</sup> whereas ST. BASIL'S answer to his friend AMPHILOCHIUS' question " τίς ἡ οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ " became a common locus for the later Fathers. In agreement with ST. GREGORY'S wording ST. BASIL points out the possibility for man to know the divine energies but not the essence.<sup>93</sup> In the same way ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA distinguishes two origins to which the existence of names is indebted; (a) the human mind and (b) the Holy Bible. In addition he says that every Name interprets " τῶν περὶ τὴν θείαν φύσιν νοουμένων " (that which we can conceive by mind), but it cannot express the meaning of the Divine Nature,<sup>94</sup> whereas ST. JOHN DAMASCENUS seems to repeat

almost word for word ST. GREGORY'S statement.<sup>95</sup> The reason why God is glad to be named is that He liked us to participate in some way in His deeper knowledge ("ἐπιγνωσις") and have even a partial and faint idea of Him.<sup>96</sup> On the other hand ST. JOANNES certainly stresses that God is prior to substance and absolutely ineffable.<sup>97</sup>

Turning now to the Greek tradition it is wonderful to say that someone recognizes an almost similar conception. Of course we must bear in mind that the philosophers had introduced analogy as the only way to reach the Deity, which is the interpretation of the ontological subordination in reverse order.<sup>98</sup> From IAMBlichus, the Neoplatonist philosopher, a close contemporary of ST. GREGORY, comes the following comment on PLATO'S *Timaeus*; he says that PLATO does not set up activities ("ἐνεργεῖαι") as being distinct from their substance; for activities proceed from their substance - source, or rather, in the case of divine entities, are coincidental with their essence.<sup>99</sup> It is note-worthy that in the fourteenth century ST. GREGORY PALAMAS says that the substance of God is inexpressible and unnamable, so when we name the one God we name all that is God, both substance and energy.<sup>100</sup>

The main problem that occupied ST. GREGORY, as well as all the Fathers, was that of the simplicity\* of the Deity. Therefore, if a name can define the Deity, which is simple in its essence, it would abolish the divine simplicity. The discussion was also of a predominant significance for the Greek philosophers, throughout which they have been led to conceive the principle of the unnameable One, which is "ἐπέκεινα πάντων" and absolutely simple.<sup>101</sup>

\*Uniqueness, indefinability (ἀπλότης) ]

On these assumptions it is more possible to analyze ST. GREGORY'S doctrine about the use of Names applied to the Deity. At the beginning of the paragraph 18 he reminds us again that the Names which he will examine in turn are "ἐκ τῶν ἡμῶν ἐφικτῶν", viz. that we can bear their knowledge; two Names in some way might denote the divine essence: He who is ("ὢν") and the name God ("θεός"), especially the first one. The name "κύριος" comes afterwards. Of course when ST. GREGORY speaks of them he refers them to each of the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity.<sup>102</sup> Thus he uses the phrase "τῆς οὐσίας ὀνόματα" as contrasted with "τῆς ἐξουσίας" in paragr. 19.

I The proper Names of the Essence or Names more appropriate to denote the essence

(a) ὢν (He who is)

This Name has been revealed to men by God Himself when God spake to Moses on the mount,<sup>103</sup> but ST. GREGORY adds that this is not <sup>the</sup> only reason for regarding the "ὢν" as the Name par excellence of the essence, and even as more appropriate than all else ("κυριωτέρα"). At this point he does not explain further the special character of the "ὢν", since he comes back to this at the very end of the same paragraph 18 with an analysis which actually needs a verbatim quotation, as follows:

"Ἡμεῖς δὲ φύσιν ἐπιζητοῦμεν, ἥ τὸ εἶναι καθ' ἑαυτό, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλω συνδεδεμένον. τὸ δὲ ὄν, ἴδιον ὄντως θεοῦ, καὶ ὅλον, μήτε τῷ πρὸ αὐτοῦ, μήτε τῷ μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἢ ἔσται, περατοῦμενον ἢ περικυπτόμενον."<sup>104</sup>

In his very philosophical statement which is a quest for a name capable to denote appropriately the nature of God "τὸ εἶναι καθ' ἑαυτό", he

finds the name "ὄν" to be the special property of God as it belongs to Him entirely, not partially as it might be the case with the rest of beings, which might have only a share in existence. Furthermore, in the second part of the above quoted fragment it must be noted that ST. GREGORY does not use again the infinitive "εἶναι" as in the first part which has a somewhat different sense ("τὸ εἶναι καθ' ἑαυτὸ"), namely what a thing is<sup>in</sup> itself; the "εἶναι" means existence as purely conceptual reality for everything, whereas the "ὄν" is peculiar ("ἰδιον") to God.

It is quite certain that the transition from the "ὦν", the personal God of O.T., to the neuter "ὄν" must be indebted to PHILO, as J. WHITTAKER pointed out,<sup>105</sup> who tried to reconcile the reference in Exod. 3, 14 with the impersonal Principle of Plato's philosophy "τὸ ὄν" or "τὸ ὄντως ὄν". In PLATO especially the "ὄντως ὄν" means the pure being, absolutely without quality<sup>and</sup> simple, <sup>the</sup> as God of the Christians.<sup>106</sup> Before ST. GREGORY, in DIDYMUS OF ALEX. the Philonic conception of the point at issue is repeated, who commenting also on Exod. 3, 14 interprets the "ὦν" purely in impersonal philosophical terms, thus: "τὸ (sc. ὄνομα) ὃ ὦν σημαίνει τὸ ἀεὶ ὄν τῆς δείας ὑποστάσεως, ... ἀόριστος γὰρ ἡ λέξις ὅθεν ὄνομα ἐ-  
αυτοῦ ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν εἶναι τὸ ὢν".<sup>107</sup> In speaking of the divine essence the Fathers were obliged to combat Eunomian tendencies within the Church, and to defend the simplicity of God which Eunomius was denying by claiming full knowledge of God's essence.<sup>108</sup> It would be a important omission if we did not recall here ST. GREGORY PALAMAS' interpretation, although he was not a contemporary ST. GREGORY; PALAMAS had



to overthrow BARLAAM'S accusation against him, according to which his doctrine of participation in the energies of God abolished the divine simplicity. As P. EVDOKIMOV has stressed there is simultaneously and autinomically a distinction and an identity ("διακρίσις-ταυτότης") in the unparticipated essence and the participated energies since the unity of God is a unity of the Living God who is simple, but not of simple essence.<sup>109</sup> ST. GREGORY PALAMAS cites exactly the passage Exod. 3, 14 in order to prove that the "ὢν" is prior to essence; as follows:

"καὶ τῷ Μωϋσῇ δὲ χρηματίζων ὁ θεός, οὐκ εἶπεν "ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ οὐσία", ἀλλ' "ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν". οὐ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας ὁ ὢν ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ ὄντος ἡ οὐσία. αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ ὢν ὅλον ἐν ἑαυτῷ συνείληφε τὸ εἶναι."<sup>110</sup>

On the other hand we must mention a passage of CLEMENT OF ALEX. where he justifies the use of the participle of the verb to be (ὢν) as the form which is above and beyond the category of time as the "ὢν" is instead of the three tenses simultaneously, viz. of "ἦν καὶ ἔστι καὶ ἔσται".<sup>111</sup> This statement of CLEMENT OF ALEX. brings us back to ST. GREGORY. At the end of paragr. 18 he says that the "ὢν" belongs to God entirely as in Him "οὐ γὰρ ἦν, ἢ ἔσται, περατούμενον ἢ περικοπτόμενον". ST. GREGORY examines the same theme again in more detail in paragraph 7 of the Oratio 38 (which is repeated verbatim as paragraph 3 of the Oratio 45). An extensive quotation of this paragraph is necessary for an additional comparison with parallel expressions of the Greek tradition:

"θεὸς ἦν μὲν αἰεί, καὶ ἔστι, καὶ ἔσται· μᾶλλον δὲ ἔστιν αἰεί. τὸ γὰρ ἦν, καὶ ἔσται, τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνου τμήματα, καὶ

της φρεστος φύσεως· ὁ δὲ ὢν ἀεὶ, καὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν  
 ὀνομάζει, τῷ Μωϋσεὶ χρηματίζων ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους. Ὅλον γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῷ  
 συλλαβὼν, ἔχει τὸ εἶναι, μήτε ἀρζάμενον, μήτε πανσόμιον, οἷόν τι πέλαιος οὐ-  
 σίας ἀπειρον καὶ ἀόριστον, πᾶσαν ὑπερεκπίπτον ἔννοιαν, καὶ χρόνου καὶ φύσεως.<sup>112</sup>

The significance of this passage consists in supplying us with an  
 explanation about the meaning of the Appellation "ὁ ὢν" and the  
 formulation of the Trinitarian dogma. ST. GREGORY probably follows  
 ST. ATHANASIUS, the first one to deal with this Name of the God of  
 O.T. in order to defend the divinity of the Son and Holy Spirit, viz.  
 the "homocousion" of the Holy Trinity. According to ST. ATHANASIUS "ὢν"  
 is the Father, "ὢν" is the Son, and the Holy Spirit holds a real  
 hypostasis also.<sup>113</sup> Similarly ST. GREGORY says that God was manifested  
 to men by birth, viz. he talks about the incarnation of the pre-existent  
 Logos, to whom he refers as "ὢν, καὶ ἀεὶ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ ἀεὶ ὄντος".<sup>114</sup>  
 On the other hand he speaks of the Holy Spirit apropos to time in a  
 verbatim quotation from the above mentioned passage, where the three  
 tenses, viz. the "ἦν ἀεὶ καὶ ἔστι καὶ ἔσται" are rendered  
 only for God. Identically in the following passage the Holy Spirit  
 "ἦν μὲν ἀεὶ, καὶ ἔστι, καὶ ἔσται, οὔτε ἀρζάμενον, οὔτε πανσό-  
 μιον, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συνεταγμένον".<sup>115</sup> Of course ST. GREGORY'S  
 purpose is to defend the eternity ("ἀιδιότης") of the Son and the  
 Holy Spirit, and on the other hand to exclude the created world from  
 the eternity of God. This latter was a radically new doctrine. Three  
 Greeks had conceived <sup>of</sup> the eternity of the Deity, but they <sup>had</sup> arrived at this  
 conclusion through the belief that the Universe is coeternal with the  
 Deity, although for them also time and space, viz. the categories of the percep-  
 tible world were a stumbling-block. To be specific, ST. GREGORY



attributes to God, or to the Persons of the Holy Trinity, absolute eternity, viz. past, present or future (" ἡν̄ αἰὲν καὶ ἔσται καὶ ἔσται ") but he does not, however, leave space for thinking that man or any part of <sup>the</sup> Creation participates by nature in divine eternity; man is of a changeable nature, he can perceive only fragments of time, the past and future, and for this reason his knowledge about God is faint and partial. We find exactly the same wording in both traditions, viz. the Greek and the Patristic one. All too often modern scholars try to make comparisons between these two traditions in order to uphold <sup>the view</sup> that the Greek Fathers <sup>sometimes</sup> hellenized this dogmatic truth and sometimes kept its evangelic integrity. In our view however, the Greek Fathers were of another ethos; because they began from the belief in the Living God of O.T. they were open to everything that might help them to interpret the Holy Economy: the presence of God through His energies in the world. For this reason we might speak of the universal and theocentric character of the Patristic thought. Thus coming back to the point at issue, ST. GREGORY obviously borrowed from Greek thought, and particularly from Plato, the idea of the eternity of God, but refuted the theory about the coeternity of creation, a point that will be discussed in detail later in chapter four of this treatise. Here it is enough to note some parallel texts from the Greek tradition in order to see as far as it is possible from the sources the extent of the influence of Greek thought on ST. GREGORY'S formulation of the biblical message.

As an ANONYMOUS scholiast pointed out ST. GREGORY borrowed the theory of the three tenses, viz. " ἡν̄ - ἔσται - ἔσται " from Plato in

order to define what is eternal, whereas the " ἦν καὶ ἔσται " belongs to <sup>the</sup> created world " περὶ τὴν ἐν χρόνῳ γένεσιν " <sup>116</sup> or as ST. GREGORY says " τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνου τμήματα, καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἁεὶ ὄντος ἐξέσεως ". The Platonic text had been commented upon previously by DIDYMUS Alex. also, and probably ST. GREGORY followed him, although the theme of eternity was very common in the philosophical and theological discussions at that time, while its original conception seems surely to belong to PARMENIDES. <sup>117</sup> To the extent that we could search the sources, PLUTARCH'S two passages are very close to ST. GREGORY'S analysis about the eternity of God. The first comes from De Ei apud Delphos and runs as follows: " Τί οὖν ὄντως ὄν ἐστί; Τὸ ἀίδιον καὶ ἀγέννητον καὶ ἀφθαρτον, ὃ χρόνος μεταβολὴν οὐδέ τις ἐπάγει... ἀλλ' ἐστὶν ὁ θεός, καὶ φάναι, καὶ ἔστι καὶ οὐδένα χρόνον, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα, τὸν ἀκίνητον καὶ ἄχρονον καὶ ἀνέμυλτον, καὶ οὐ πρότερον οὐδὲν ἐστὶν οὐδ' ὕστερον... ἀλλ' εἰς ὧν ἐν τῷ νῦν τὸ ἀπεσλήρωκε. καὶ μόνον ἐστὶ τὸ κατὰ τοῦτον (sc. τὸν αἰῶνα) ὄντως ὄν, οὐδεχρονός, οὐδ' ἀρξάμενον οὐδὲ πανσόμενον " <sup>118</sup>

In this passage God is identified with the " ὄν ", which is not limited or cut short by any Before or After ( ἀρξάμενον-πανσόμενον ).

The second passage comes from PLUTARCH'S Ethics and is referred to as an epigraph on the temple of Isis ( = the wisdom of God, from the root Fīd of the verb " οἶδα " ) in Egypt, and is of a similar texture and wording: " Ἐγὼ εἰμι πᾶν τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ὄν καὶ ἐσόμενον καὶ τὸν ἐμὸν πέπλον οὐδείς πω θνητὸς ἀπεκαλύψεν ". <sup>119</sup> Of course one is reminded of the witness of the book of Revelation that the Living God is " ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ", <sup>120</sup> and surely this biblical witness is the centre of ST. GREGORY'S theology. Furthermore,

where the Philosophers sought to conceive<sup>of</sup> an abstract essence, the Fathers confessed that Jesus Christ was the Incarnate God, defending thus the incomprehensibility of the divine essence. They appealed firmly to the Scriptures and the revelation of the Living God within His Divine Dispensation, by which ST. GREGORY explains the O.T. theophanies. Moses, to whom God called Himself "Ὁν", saw only the 'back parts' of God ("ὁ πρὸς ὀπίσθια"),<sup>121</sup> that means that Moses foresaw the Incarnate Logos by whom God the Father is manifested, an interpretation correlated to the idea that the essence of God is unmoved. The incarnation according to ST. GREGORY is a certain point from which we should gain a vision of God, as Moses did, without being then overwhelmed by the greatness of the revelation and the glory of God.<sup>122</sup> ST. GREGORY confesses that he also had the same experience as Moses, but, however, he never reached the First and Pure nature of God, known only to the Holy Trinity.<sup>123</sup>

The "Ὁν" is the most important appellation of God, but even this persuades man only that God exists, not what He is.<sup>124</sup>

(b) θεός (God)

The appellation "θεός" (God) is mentioned in the same paragraph 18 as the second Name of the essence after the "Ὁν".<sup>125</sup> It is characterized by ST. GREGORY as a relative Name, and not an absolute one. This is affirmed by the etymology of the word itself, although ST. GREGORY is so reluctant to deal with this kind of matter that he leaves them for those who are skilful in these things "τοῖς περὶ ταῦτα κομψοῖς".<sup>126</sup> Nevertheless he explicitly refers to two etymological meanings of the word "θεός", the second of which is

analyzed quite extensively, as he seems to accept it, rather than its derivation from "θεῖν",<sup>127</sup> according to Plato.<sup>128</sup> On the other hand the derivation from the "αἰθεῖν" is found also among other Fathers<sup>129</sup> who refer it to the O.T., as ST. GREGORY also interprets it in relation to <sup>the</sup> passage Deut. 4, 24. It is obvious that ST. GREGORY justifies the name "θεός" from His energies, as it is that one of "θεῖν" or more properly of "αἰθεῖν". ST. BASIL, ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA, ST. JOHN DAMASCENUS and later ST. GREGORY PALAMAS have developed further the doctrine about the divine energies by which the Christians name God,<sup>130</sup> while ST. GREGORY is concerned with the defence of the homousion of the Divine Hypostaseis. Thus he attributes the name "θεός" to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit in order to defend the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit. In another Oration he characterizes the name "θεός" as the common name of the Three Persons,<sup>131</sup> while sometimes he mentions as a common name the synonym "θεότης" (Godhead).<sup>132</sup> Furthermore he identifies the common name God, one and the same for every one of the Three Persons, with the one essence and one nature which all three share in common.<sup>133</sup> This is the reason why ST. GREGORY insisted on the acceptance by the Fathers of the Second Ecumenical Council of the homousion of the Holy Spirit as well as their declaration that He is God as the Father and the Son.<sup>134</sup>

(c) κύριος (Lord)

This Name, by which God is called in the Septuagint, is ultimately applied to the Hebrew Jehovah because it also translates the substitutes of the letter. ST. GREGORY refers to Isa. 52, 8 and Amos 9, 6, Psal. 57, 5 and he clearly says that this also is a "vox" which is a

name of God. The reason why it is a 'vox' (" φωνή "),<sup>135</sup> and not an entire word, is attributed to the fact that it substitutes in the Septuagint the Ineffable Name.<sup>136</sup> In the original text the four-lettered word ( τετραγράμματον ),<sup>137</sup> as the Fathers quote it, would have appeared and this writing is corresponding to the phrase " οἱ γὰρ (sc. Jews) χαρακτηροῦν ἰδίους τὸ θεῖον τιμώσαντες ".<sup>138</sup> ST. GREGORY applies this name equally to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, again in order to state the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit.<sup>139</sup> In the Oratio on the Arrival of <sup>the</sup> Egyptians ST. GREGORY accuses of blasphemy all <sup>those</sup> who do not reckon the Holy Spirit as God because the Lord is that which is blasphemed, and that which avenges<sup>140</sup> is the Holy Spirit, " δῆλον ὡς κύριος ".<sup>141</sup> In addition, it must be noted that he brings <sup>in</sup> a liturgical witness to confess that the Three Holies (sc. Hypostaseis) are united into One Lord<sup>142</sup> which indicates the Primal Substance, viz. the homocousion.<sup>143</sup> This is apparent from another passage where the synonymous property of the Lord, viz. the " κυριότης ", is identified with the Godhead.<sup>144</sup>

In conclusion, the three more appropriate Names of <sup>the</sup> Godhead, viz. " ὢν, -θεός, κύριος " are Names of the essence of God in the sense that as they are applied equally to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and manifest the unity of the Three Persons, which is unity of essence in the last <sup>analysis</sup> these Names safeguard the homocousion of the Hypostaseis of God.

## II The common Names of His Authority

Apart from the Names of the divine essence itself

ST. GREGORY introduces one more class of Names which are applied to the manifestation of God throughout creation; they are known as common Names ("κοινὰ ὀνόματα" or "προσηγορίαι")<sup>145</sup> and are classified into two categories, viz. (a) the Names of His Authority and (b) the Names of His Economy.

Having dealt with the essential Names in the previous paragraph we will examine in turn the common Names which denote Authority; and we begin with the appellation "Παντοκράτωρ". The term in the O.T. has been used by the Septuagint to render the Almighty or the Master of all, as in Exod. 15, 3, where this Name indicates in some way His control over all things. With this sense the Name "Παντοκράτωρ" is found in the Apologists who combined it with the Platonic idea of the First Principle ("πρώτη ἀρχὴ") from which everything derives and to which everything returns. In Epist. Ad. Autol. especially, THEOPHILUS ANT. stresses the omnipotence of God in philosophical fashion in a passage very close to ORIGEN'S doctrine of the coeternity of all beings. "Παντοκράτωρ δέ, ὅτι αὐτὸς τὰ πάντα κρατεῖ καὶ ὑπερῖχει".<sup>146</sup> Furthermore, ST. ATHANASIUS<sup>147</sup> repeats almost identically THEOPHILUS' interpretation, but he applies the name "Παντοκράτωρ" to the Son in order to defend the divinity of the latter.<sup>148</sup> Some years later the Cappadocian Fathers would refute the Eunomian heresy in ST. ATHANASIUS' terms. Thus while EUNOMIUS considered the name "Παντοκράτωρ" as a particular property of the Father, [as



well as the property "ἀγέννητος" (unbegotten) ] coming to his dialectical conclusion that the Son is a part of the creation and created, ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA<sup>149</sup> and ST. GREGORY explicitly attribute it to the Holy Trinity: "Μία Τριάς γάρ, εἰς Θεὸς Παντοκράτωρ".<sup>150</sup>  
<sup>the two GREGORIES</sup>  
 It is probable that V borrowed the original idea from DIDYMUS ALEX. The latter asserts that the meaning of the word "Παντοκράτωρ" is so obvious as to make any further interpretation unnecessary. The Holy Spirit is "Παντοκράτωρ" since He has the same and undivided kingdom as the Father and He is <sup>also</sup> Lord over all things.<sup>151</sup> Granted that DIDYMUS confesses the homousion of the Holy Spirit clearly, his view verifies the deeper interconnection between the Cappadocian Fathers and the Alexandrian theologians.

DIDYMUS' above mentioned interpretation of the name "Παντοκράτωρ" leaves <sup>ing</sup> space for passion to the appellation "βασιλεύς" (king). ST. GREGORY refers to this in *paragr.* 14, with a variety of senses, thus: "ὁ βασιλεύς, ἢ τῆς δόξης, ἢ τῶν αἰώνων, ἢ τῶν δυνάμεων, ἢ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ, ἢ τῶν βασιλευόντων".<sup>152</sup> At first the name "βασιλεύς" bears an absolute meaning (the king of His kingdom) which is very close to that of "Παντοκράτωρ", as DIDYMUS had explained. In another passage from the Gregorian Corpus the name "βασιλεύς" is referred to Christ, as His domination extends over all "βασιλεῖεν γὰρ λέγεται (sc. ὁ υἱός), καθ' ἓν μὲν, ὡς Παντοκράτωρ, καὶ θελόντων, καὶ μὴ, βασιλεύς".<sup>153</sup> Of course it is obvious that the ultimate goal remains the divinity of the Son. In the above passage the "καθ' ἓν" is attributed to "καὶ θελόντων, καὶ μὴ (sc. θελόντων)", which means that even the opponents will be subjected to the divine power

of Christ, as after the Second Coming of Christ His Kingdom will be imposed to all adversaries as a spiritual power, "ὡς ἐνεργῶν τὴν ὑποταγὴν".<sup>154</sup> Christ as the second Adam will be the king who will hand over His kingdom to the Father, inasmuch as "τῆς μὲν οὖν ἐκείνως νοουμένης (sc. in the former sense) βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται πέρας".<sup>155</sup> Of His kingdom there shall be no end, since the kingdom is One and the Same for the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.<sup>156</sup> Some years later ST. CYRIL OF ALEX. uses the verb "βασιλεύειν" to indicate the authority and the royal power of God the Father who functions throughout the Mystery of the Holy Economy "δὲ Ἰσοῦ ἐν Πνεύματι".<sup>157</sup> The doctrine of the identity of the function of the three persons with the same royal power has an inner relation with the name "Βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης" (the king of glory). ST. GREGORY attributes <sup>the</sup> glory equally to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, the One Godhead, now and for ever ("εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας").<sup>158</sup> Furthermore, he identifies the glory of God with His kingdom<sup>159</sup> as well as the illumination and the divine light.<sup>160</sup>

In turn the genitive "τῶν αἰώνων" is attached to the name "Βασιλεὺς" (king of the ages). This Name is also of a paramount importance, as it is possible to define in some way the character of the kingdom. The fact of the matter is that the defence of the eternity ("αἰδιότης") of the Son and the Holy Spirit is a vexed and controversial problem; thus the recognition of The Son and The Holy Spirit, i.e. that <sup>they</sup> are of the same royal power over time, states ~~their~~ coeternity and consubstantiality, viz. their homocousion with the Father.<sup>161</sup>



The next Name is "ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν δυνάμεων" (The king of the powers) or "ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν δυνάμεων τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ",<sup>162</sup> (The king of the Powers of the Beloved). This is one more Title that comes directly from the Bible. Later ZIGABENUS (1050-1120)<sup>163</sup> says that the "δυνάμεις τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ" are the Apostles, while another one N. BLEMIDES (1197-1271)<sup>164</sup> interprets the "δυνάμεις", apart from "τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ", as the heavenly hosts. We would accept ZIGABENUS' interpretation within the framework of the Holy Economy as the adjective "ἀγαπητός" is referred to Christ in His Economic manifestation after the incarnation in accordance with His Baptism (Matth. 3, 17) and His Transfiguration (Matth. 17, 5). The last attribution to the name "βασιλεὺς" comes from the New Testament,<sup>165</sup> viz. "βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων", and contains an eschatological goal, according to which in the coming life the Saints will reign as "βασιλεῖον ἱεράτευμα".<sup>166</sup> Later interpreters comment side by side upon the names "ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων καὶ κύριος τῶν κυριευόντων".<sup>167</sup>

Relative to the name "βασιλεὺς" is that of "κύριος" as it becomes obvious from the second part of I Tim. 6, 15. In paragraph 19 of the fourth Theol. Oration the word is regarded by ST. GREGORY as equivalent to the Jewish Sabbath, but with the clarification that in this point at issue the Name is accompanied by the attributions "τῶν στρατιῶν, τῶν δυνάμεων, τῶν κυριευόντων",<sup>168</sup> viz. the "ὅπερ" is the explanation that belongs to "κύριος", thus: "καὶ ὁ κύριος, ἢ σαβαώθ, ὅπερ ἔστι στρατιῶν, ἢ τῶν δυνάμεων, ἢ τῶν κυριευόντων". It is noteworthy that a parallel

interpretation is given by ORIGEN as follows: "ὡς ἄρχοντα δὲ στρατοπέδων, δυνάμεων ἐυάλεσαν κύριον, ὅπερ ἐν τῷ ἑβραϊκῷ Σαβαώθ ἔρρηται".<sup>169</sup> Obviously the use of the term "κύριος" in this case as a common name refers to the common energies of the Trinity, whereas its use as an essential name is connected with the one essence.

### III The common Names of His Οἰκονομία [Economy]

To sum up, we saw that the names Almighty, King, Lord, signify the power of God. There are however other common names which denote God's specific manifestation in the Mystery of the Holy Economy, and especially in the biblical tradition, as it is apparent from ST. GREGORY'S statement:

"Ὁ δὲ θεός, ἡ τοῦ σώζειν, ἡ ἐκδικήσεων, ἡ εἰρήνης, ἡ δικαιοσύνης, ἡ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ Ἰσαάκ, καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ παντὸς Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ πνευματικοῦ καὶ ὁρῶντος θεοῦ· ταῦτα δὲ τῆς οἰκονομίας· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τρισὶ τούτοις διοικούμεθα, δέει τε τιμωρίας, καὶ σωτηρίας ἑλπίδι, πρὸς δὲ καὶ δόξης, καὶ ἀσκήσει τῶν ἀρετῶν. Ἐξ ὧν τούτων τὸ μὲν τῶν ἐκδικήσεων ὄνομα οἰκονομεῖ τὸν φόβον, τὸ δὲ τῶν σωτηριῶν τὴν ἑλπίδα, τὸ δὲ τῶν ἀρετῶν τὴν ἀσκήσιν· ἢ ὡς τὸν θεὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ φέρον, ὃ τούτων τι κατορθῶν, μάχον ἐπείγεται πρὸς τὸ τέλος, καὶ τὴν ἐξ αὐτῶν τελειῶσιν".<sup>170</sup>

At first the name "The God of Salvation" corresponds to the adjacent phrase "σωτηρίας ἑλπίδι" and to the other one "τὸ δὲ" (sc. name) τῶν σωτηριῶν τὴν ἑλπίδα of the above quoted text, all of which Titles are quite suitable for designating the function of the Son in the whole Divine Dispensation.<sup>171</sup> In addition, the names God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and of all Spiritual Israel are applied to the dispensational manifestation of God in the O.T., to The Jewish Patriarchs as typological representatives of the Spiritual Israel, namely the Christian nation.

From CYRIL OF ALEX. comes the particular interpretation that the name "θεός τοῦ πνευματικοῦ Ἰσραήλ" is equivalent to "ὁ τῶν ἁγίων" <sup>172</sup> (so. Christians) θεός ", inasmuch as Christians constitute the new nation. <sup>173</sup> Of course, speaking of the dispensational work of God, it must be taken for granted that the three Persons act in common, the Father through the Son in <sup>the</sup> Holy Spirit. <sup>174</sup>

The next name of God as "θεός τῶν ἔκδικήσεων" (vengeance) corresponds to "τὸ μὲν τῶν ἔκδικήσεων ὄνομα οἱ υιονομεῖ τὸν φόβον" and to "δέει τιμωρίας", which is applied to the manifestation of the Father in the O.T. with reference to the divine command to Adam and Eve after their fall, <sup>175</sup> while the name "θεός τῆς εἰρήνης" and "τῆς δικαιοσύνης" seems to refer to the Holy Spirit <sup>176</sup> and the Son respectively. <sup>177</sup> The latter Name especially is a broad hint for the final Judgement which is coming. Certainly this meaning of the name "God of Righteousness" is found deeply connected with the phrase "καὶ σωτηρίας ἐλπίδι, πρὸς δὲ καὶ δόξης", as glory is the final good of our salvation and the recompence of the blessed life in the coming ages.

The Christians' life of the participation in the divine glory is based upon the Ascension of Christ who thus has introduced the human being into the divine life "ὅτι μετὰ τοῦ σώματος ἔστιν, οὗ προσέλαβε, ἕως ἄν ἡμεῖς ποιήσῃ θεὸν τῇ δυνάμει τῇ ἀναδρωτικῇ". <sup>178</sup> It seems not unjustified therefore to put side by side the two parts of the phrase "σωτηρίας ἐλπίδι, πρὸς δὲ καὶ δόξης", leaving thus the end "καὶ ἀσκήσει τῶν ἀρετῶν" in the parallel phrase which corresponds

to the third Name " τὸ δὲ τῶν ἀρετῶν, τὴν ἀσυνήθειαν ". On this assumption we suggested a textual correction of the whole passage which has just been quoted correctly.

The text runs <sup>the</sup> in P.G., in MASON and GALLAY editions as follows :  
 " Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τρισὶ τοῖς διοικόμεθα, δέει τε τιμωρίας, καὶ σωτηρίας ἑλπίδι, πρὸς δὲ καὶ δόξης, καὶ ἀσυνήσει τῶν ἀρετῶν, ἐξ ὧν ταῦτα. τὸ μὲν τῶν ἐκδικήσεων ὄνομα διοικομένη τὸν φόβον. τὸ δὲ τῶν σωτηρίων τὴν ἑλπίδα. τὸ δὲ τῶν ἀρετῶν τὴν ἀσυνήθειαν "

Firstly we need a link-word at the beginning of the second part of the whole meaning of unity, viz. before " τὸ μὲν τῶν ἐκδικήσεων ", in order to justify the use of the distributive phrase " τὸ μὲν... τὸ δέ... τὸ δέ... ". By emmending the " ταῦτα " to " τούτων ", dropping the semicolon after it, and putting a semicolon before the " ἐξ ὧν ", we should have quite a sound sense. A. MASON<sup>179</sup> refers the " ταῦτα " to " σωτηρία " and " δόξα ", as he perceives the context in a moral sense, an interpretation which P. GALLAY follows in his translation in French, thus: 'En effet, puisque nous sommes régis par ces trois choses : crainte du châtement, espérance du salut et aussi de la gloire, et pratique des vertus d'où viennent salut et gloire, le nom des vengeances nous dispense la crainte; celui des choses du salut, l'espérance; celui des vertus, leur mise en pratique'.<sup>180</sup>

In this solution, however, there is the arbitrary interpretation of referring the pronoun " ταῦτα ", referred to " σωτηρία " and " δόξα ", because the phrase " δέει τιμωρίας " which is of the same syntactic form with that of " σωτηρίας ἑλπίδι " is excluded without <sup>any</sup> syntactic

justification. On the contrary the same syntactic structure of the "δέει τιμωρίας", "σωτηρίας ἑλπίδι", (πρὸς δὲ καὶ δόξης, sc. ἑλπίδι), and "καὶ ἀσκήσει τῶν ἀρετῶν", demands the same definitions. On the other hand our interpretation of

"ταῦτα", changed to the genitive "τούτων", puts it in close relation with the distributive phrase "τὸ μὲν... τὸ δέ... τὸ δέ" as an intermediate link between the two parts of the aforecited passage.

This will be clear from what comes after and especially from the meaning of the phrase "καὶ ἀσκήσει τῶν ἀρετῶν". A. MASON, whom P. GALLAY follows as well, discusses the point without taking into account its repetition side by side with "τὸ μὲν τῶν ἐκδικήσεων... τὸ δὲ τῶν σωτηριῶν" coming then to the conclusion that the verb "διοικούμεθα" is used with a different sense from that one with which it is used in the phrase "δέει τιμωρίας" and "σωτηρίας ἑλπίδι".<sup>181</sup>

Therefore A. MASON alleges that we are governed by two great prevailing motives (sc. "δέος" and "ἐλπίς") and by one great moral principle (sc. "ἀσκησις"). There are three objections to MASON'S opinion. (a) We must not neglect the particular syntactic use of the genitive "ἀρετῶν" in the three cases of paragraph 19, that is: "ἀσκήσει τῶν ἀρετῶν", "τὸ δὲ τῶν ἀρετῶν (sc. ὄνομα) τὴν ἀσκησιν", "τὴν ἐξ ἀρετῶν οἰκείωσιν". (b) We must examine the general texture of the whole paragraph. (c) ST. GREGORY'S statement "ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἔτι κοινὰ θεότητος τὰ ὀνόματα", after the conclusive clause "ὡς... οἰκείωσιν", which seems to leave no space for misunderstanding the trinitarian doctrine which is declared at the beginning: "ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τρισὶ τούτοις διοικούμεθα...". On

the other hand <sup>NPNE</sup> although it keeps a general sense for the translation of "ταῦτα" as 'by which these are attained', perfectly <sup>accurately</sup> the sound meaning of the rest of the passage, thus: 'the Name of the God of Vengeance governs fear, and that of the God of Salvation our hope, and that of the God of Virtues our practice'.<sup>182</sup> After our correction, which is not suggested by the manuscripts, the translation into English might be the following: 'Since we are governed by these three, viz. the fear of punishment, the hope of salvation and of glory as well, and the practice of the virtues, of those three which the Name of the God of Vengeance governs fear, and that of the God of Salvation our hope, and that of the God of Virtues our practice'.

It seems quite obvious that ST. GREGORY, in paragr. 19 of the fourth Theological Oration, deals with the elucidation of the common Names of the Authority and <sup>the</sup> Economy of God. For this latter classification he firmly stresses that it must be viewed under a twofold aspect, being dependent upon the incarnation, viz. that the Names which are classified under the title of Economy must be divided further into two categories; one before and <sup>another after</sup> the incarnation, "τῆς μὲν ὑπὲρ τὸ σῶμα, τῆς δὲ ἐν σῶματι".<sup>183</sup> Of course the word "οἰκονομία" expresses the Divine Dispensation, not an abstract <sup>notion of</sup> divine Government. God then "οἰκονομεῖ", viz. prepares man in order to manifest Himself in such a way that man might respond to the intervention of God in human history for his own salvation. Therefore the above examined common names of the Economy of God before the incarnation are: The God of Salvation, of Vengeance, of Peace, of Righteousness, of Abraham, Isaak and Jacob, while in the incarnation they are: The God of



Salvation and of Virtues. It is certainly difficult to define precisely this division, since the Divine Dispensation itself remains a mystery, just as the incarnation. We can only discern the saving effects of the Economy which point to the Presence of the One God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

To summarise the main points of this discussion, which probably runs the risk of being characterized<sup>as</sup> prolix, we shall give a schematic representation, as follows:

A. I Names of God's essence:

(a) Ἰωv

(b) θεός

(c) κύριος

II Names of God's authority:

(a) παντοκράτωρ

(b) βασιλεύς

1. τῆς δόξης

2. τῶν αἰώνων

3. τῶν δυνάμεων τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ

4. τῶν βασιλευνόντων

(c) σαβάωθ

(d) κύριος

1. τῶν στρατιῶν

2. τῶν δυνάμεων

3. τῶν κυριευόντων



### III. Names of God's Economy:

#### (a) Before the Incarnation

1. τοῦ σῶζειν
2. ἑκδικήσεων
3. εἰρήνης
4. δικαιοσύνης
5. Ἀβραάμ, Ἰσαάκ, Ἰακώβ

#### (b) In the Incarnation [παντὸς Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ πνευματικοῦ]

1. τῶν σωτηριῶν
2. τῶν ἀρετῶν

#### B. The Revelation of God throughout His Economy

Name	Divine Presence	Soteriological Results
τῶν ἑκδικήσεων	τιμωρία	δέος
τῶν σωτηριῶν	ἐλπίς	σωτηρία
τῶν ἀρετῶν	παιδεία	δικείωσις
		<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="font-size: 3em; margin-right: 10px;">}</div> <div> τελείωσις [Ultimate Purpose] </div> </div>

This threefold classification is indicative of the inner relation which exists between the soteriological presuppositions and the final goal of salvation, viz. the perfection, in other words, theology and Economy.<sup>184</sup> Furthermore ST. GREGORY speaks of stages within the Mystery of the Holy Economy, as corresponding to the gradual Revelation of the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity, accompanied by the so called earthquakes.<sup>185</sup>

S. PAPADOPOULOS recently engaged upon the interpretation of the spiritual earthquakes in ST. GREGORY'S works, which he identifies with

three stages in the Holy Economy.<sup>186</sup> In addition he proceeded to identify the three earthquakes with what he calls three Testaments ("Διαθήκαι").<sup>187</sup> But so far as I can take a stand in this matter, I must express my caution for Prof. PAPADOPOULOS' interpretation. I am of the opinion that, it is a more infallible method in interpreting ST. GREGORY'S particular texts, to relate them closely with the biblical and patristic tradition in general. The main passage which S. PAPADOPOULOS relied on, runs as follows: *Δύο γεγονόσιν μεταθέσεις βίων ἐπιφανεῖς ἐκ τοῦ παντός αἰῶνος, αἱ καὶ δύο διαθήκαι καλοῦνται, καὶ σεισμοὶ γῆς, διὰ τὸ τοῦ ὁράματος περιβόητον ἡμῶν ἀποτὼν εἰδώλων ἐπὶ τὸν νόμον, ἢ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου πρὸς τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον. Καὶ τρίτον σεισμόν εὐαγγελίζομεθα, τὴν ἑντεῦθεν ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκείσε μεταστάσιν, τὰ μνηεὶ κινούμενα, μὴδὲ σαλευόμενα*<sup>188</sup>

In order to correlate the number of earthquakes with the Testaments, he completely superficially appeals to another passage,<sup>189</sup> giving an inaccurate reference, viz. 'this term (sc. Τρίτη. Διαθήκη) has been used by some others (!) and Gregory repeats it'. In this latter passage ST. GREGORY argues with Pneumatomachian, who rejected the divinity of the Holy Spirit and His specific mode of existence under the pretext of lack of biblical witness and of the word "ἐκπορευτόν" not being mentioned in either of the Testaments. He criticizes his interpretative method, and calls his assumed Pneumatomachian disputer ironically "ὁ Θεολόγος". The particular text is as follows: "Ποῦ γὰρ θῆ-  
σεις τὸ ἐκπορευτόν, εἶπε μοι, μέσον ἀναφανέν τῆς οἰκτιρῆσεως,<sup>190</sup>  
καὶ παρὰ κρείσσονος ἢ κατὰ σὲ Θεολόγου,<sup>191</sup> τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, εἰσαγόμενον;<sup>192</sup> Εἰ μὴ τὴν φωνὴν ἑκείνην τῶν ὁσίων ἐξέτης Εὐαγγελίων, διὰ τὴν Τρίτην σου Διαθήκην, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, ὃ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται"<sup>193</sup>

It is clear that there is not any inner relation between the two passages, to which PAPADOPOULOS appeals, identifying the Τρίτη Διαθήκη of this passage, with the time of the special function of the Holy Spirit. In the first passage, paragr. 25, ST. GREGORY explicitly talks about the two Testaments which he also calls "transpositions of life" ("μεταθέσεις βίου") and earthquakes, on account of the wide fame of the matter, which refers to the two Testaments. On the other hand in the second passage the whole texture, as we have already mentioned, of ST. GREGORY'S criticism is of an ironical character; the term Τρίτη Διαθήκη is here used in a strict ironical manner in order to expose the literal method of <sup>the</sup> Pneumatomachians which enable them to establish a kind of "third Testament" (!); they denied the ἑκπορευτόν, although in JOHN'S Gospel the verb ἑκπορεύεται bears the same meaning.

A. MASON<sup>194</sup> makes a special comment on the phrase τὴν Τρίτην σου Διαθήκην, which he translates 'to suit your Third Testament' or 'your Newest Testament', and LNPNEF seems probably to follow his translation: 'Or perhaps you have taken that word out of your Gospel for the sake of your Third Testament';<sup>195</sup> A. HARNACK<sup>196</sup> acknowledges that he does not know 'what the Τρίτη Διαθήκη of the Macedonians was'.<sup>197</sup>

ST. GREGORY used the same ironical expression against APOLLINARIUS, who had paraphrased the Scriptures poetically, "Εἰ δὲ οἱ μακροὶ λόγοι καὶ τὰ νέα ψαλτήρια καὶ ἀντίφθογγα τῷ Δαυὶδ καὶ ἡ τῶν μέτρων χάρις ἡ Τρίτη Διαθήκη νομίζεται, καὶ ἡμεῖς ψαλμολογήσομεν." <sup>198</sup> ST. ATHANASIUS also faced the same problem in

his discussions with <sup>the</sup> 'Tropici' as T. E. POLLARD points out. Granted that the Tropici and Pneumatomachians agreed on the literal interpretation of the Scriptures, as the Arians had done before them, it is obvious that ST. GREGORY by the term "Τρίτη Διαθήκη" criticizes the 'selective literalism' of his contemporary Pneumatomachians.<sup>199</sup>

Let us now see what is the meaning of the so called transpositions man's life ("μεταθέσεις") and the earthquakes ("σεισμοί") and on the other hand, what kind of correlation exists between them and the two Testaments. ST. GREGORY regards the time from the fall of Adam and Eve to the invitation of Abraham, or more specifically to the establishment of the Law,<sup>200</sup> as an idolatrous period.<sup>201</sup> At the giving of the Law on Mt. Sinai, the first earthquake, with which the O.T. begins, is referred to, marking out the transposition of men's life from the idols to the Law. The second earthquake is identified with the giving of the New Testament, which marks the transposition from the Law to the Gospel.<sup>202</sup> Afterwards ST. GREGORY refers to a third earthquake, about which we are taught in the Gospel ("ἐν ἁ γὰρ ἐλθὼν μεθ' αὐτὸν"), but which does not correspond to any other Testament. This last earthquake is called the final transference ("μεταστάσις") from this earth to that which cannot be shaken or moved. So we can tabulate the main points at issue, as follows:

- (a) First earthquake: Change from idols to the Law : First Testament
- (b) Second earthquake: Change from the Law to the Gospel : Second Testament [Gospel]
- (c) Third earthquake: Final transference : Perfection.

Furthermore ST. GREGORY vindicates the gradual character of the Revelation of God in paedagogic terms; . . . Our faith will be more durable and safe, if we have the possibility to move ahead by persuasion, because nothing that is involuntary is durable;<sup>203</sup> so God acts as a Tutor or Physician withdrawing partly the ancestral stage ("πατρίων") and partly condoning some points in our lives.<sup>204</sup> Therefore each of the two Testaments has been established for a particular purpose with the final one <sup>being</sup> man's Perfection.<sup>205</sup> Of course perfection begins from the time of the New Testament and is extended eternally by the grace of the Holy Spirit, as ST. GREGORY states at the very beginning of paragr. 26,<sup>206</sup> where he connects the true knowledge of the Holy Trinity with the Revelation of the Three Persons in the two Testaments. The Old Testament proclaimed the Father openly, and the Son more faintly. The New Testament revealed the Son and suggested the divinity of the Holy Spirit.<sup>207</sup> The demonstration of the Holy Spirit begins at Pentecost and dwells among us "ἐμπολιτεύεται νῦν τὸ Πνεῦμα";<sup>208</sup> for this reason we speak of a life in the grace of the Holy Spirit. The particular function of the Holy Spirit does not consist of another Testament, since by His Ascension Christ fulfilled the dispensational period being Himself a fulfilment of the Law and the Prophets.<sup>209</sup> For this reason, the Person of Christ is the starting point for Christians in acknowledging the divinity of the Holy Spirit, <sup>and</sup> gradually progressing from glory to glory.<sup>210</sup> Finally the Holy Spirit is the Person who constitutes the Church and teaches the Christian what Christ's divinity <sup>is</sup>.<sup>211</sup> On the other hand this firm link between the Son of God the Father and the Holy Spirit is the basis for the declaration of the

"homocousion" of the Holy Spirit.<sup>212</sup> ST. GREGORY recapitulates his long discussion with the confession of the divinity of the Three Persons, thus: "Ἐχὼ μὲν οὕτω περὶ τούτων, καὶ ἔχοιμι, καὶ ὅστις ἔμοι φίλος, σέβειν Θεὸν τὸν Πατέρα, Θεὸν τὸν Υἱόν, Θεὸν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τρεῖς ἰδιότητες θεότητα μίαν".<sup>213</sup>

### CHAPTER III

#### GREEK MONOTHEISM

In their quest for an interpretation of creation as a universal whole the Greek philosophers reached the theory of the One highest Principle. This was the consequence of the political tendency of the Metropolitane Hellenism to impose a universal order which might safeguard the universal unity. Thus, tracing<sup>the steps</sup> back to HOMER, HESIOD and the Great ancient Tragedians, we can recognize the amazing conflict between the old gods and the new religious views, viz. the "new gods," who became gradually more spiritual, more enlightened, more harmonious with each other than their pre-Homeric ancestors. ST. GREGORY is aware of the varied development of ancient Greek religion, especially of the idea of the new and old elements; he is explicit in paragraph XV of Or. 25: "Σύγχει μὲν καὶ τὴν Ἑλληνῶν δεισιδαιμονίαν, ὥς πρότερον, καὶ τὴν πολυθεὸν αὐτῶν ἀθείαν (what an irony! ), καὶ τοὺς παλαιοὺς θεοὺς καὶ τοὺς νέους".<sup>1</sup>

This conflict between the old and the new religious elements were continued during the centuries, and its outcome resulted in the theory of the absolute One of philosophy, which was formulated into a marvellous system by the latest Neoplatonists. Seeking the first Cause and Principle the ancient philosophy was able to bind together the god Universe and the human being as an entirety.



So JAMBLICHUS, to mention a close contemporary of ST. GREGORY, declared that Philosophy is in an endless relation to theology: "ἐπὶ πάσης μὲν φιλοσοφίας ὁρμῇ θεὸν δῆπου παρακαλεῖν ἔθος ἔπασσι τοῖς γε σώφροσιν".<sup>2</sup>

In this way the Theologians of the Church considered their work as completing Greek philosophy, but in no way<sup>as</sup> completing Greek theurgical religion.<sup>3</sup>

The philosophical tendency toward the One Principle was a dramatic event: the final attempt to achieve a monotheistic conception of the ultimate deity. It is indebted to<sup>the</sup> Alexandrian Fathers for its sensitive approach<sup>to</sup> and interpretation of this monotheism, beginning with CLEMENT of ALEXANDRIA. CLEMENT maintains that the monotheistic view of God is a belief of the people who "εὖ φρονοῦσι", viz. who think and contemplate rightly. The appearance of the idea of One Omnipotent God was considered by CLEMENT to exist in all people by nature.<sup>4</sup>

L. PHILIPPIDES<sup>5</sup> follows the same line when he claims that the appearance of a multitude of new gods every time is illustrated by the event that even the lower classes of the ancient and especially of the Hellenistic society were unsatisfied with the traditional polytheon. In addition, we might speak of a monotheistic tendency within the broadest masses, an example of which the Oration by ST. PAUL at Areopagus in Athens is so characteristic. The idea of an ultimate unknown God was rumoured, thus ST. PAUL held discussions not only in the synagogue with the Jews of Athens, but with the people who happened to pass by in the public square every day,<sup>6</sup> as well as with some Epicurean and

Stoic philosophers. This idea although it was formulated as an abstract monistic notion only in the latest antiquity, nonetheless its origin goes back to pre-Homeric poetry, which was purely theological, namely the so called Orphic tradition.<sup>7</sup> This point is most remarkable as the origin of the Greek polytheism<sup>8</sup> is attributed to the Orphic poetry. According to Orphic theological poetry not only the god is One, Maker and Provider<sup>9</sup> of all, but the world is one as well, which entails a unique order in all creation. It is noteworthy that the phraseology of this poetry is found to be very close to that of the O.T. The following Orphic extract brings to mind the first of the ten commandments of the Jewish Law.

I Orph. Frag. E. ABEL op. cit., p.146, v.13:

"Οὐδέ τις ἑσθ' ἕτερος χωρὶς μεγάλου βασιλῆος.  
Αὐτὸν δ' οὐχ' ὁρώω· περὶ γὰρ νέφος ἑστῆρικται".<sup>10</sup>

II Exod. 20.2-3

"Εγὼ εἰμι Κύριος ὁ θεός σου... οὐκ ἔσονται σοι  
θεοὶ ἕτεροι πλὴν ἐμοῦ".<sup>11</sup>

According to L. PHILIPPIDES the differentiation between the pure monotheism, either the Jewish one or the so called Orphic monotheism, both of which are illustrated above, lies in three crucial points

(a) The Orphic god is considered to exist in the Universe, viz. in all the beings, without being identified with the Universe.<sup>12</sup>

(b) The god is identified with the Universe in a pantheistic way<sup>13</sup> and the parts of this anthropomorphic god are identified with the elements of nature.<sup>14</sup>

(c) Respectively, the Universe exists in the god,<sup>15</sup> when we can speak of a kind of a pure pantheism and furthermore of the idea of the deity with a great variety of names, as in the following characteristic extract:

"Εἷς Ζεὺς, εἷς Ἄϊδης, εἷς Διόνυσος,  
εἷς θεὸς ἔν παντεσι· τί σοι δίχ' αὐτ' ἀγορεύω;"<sup>16</sup>

In turn, the theology of Homeric and Hesiodic poetry expresses the idea of One<sup>17</sup> god as the highest among the rest of the gods,<sup>18</sup> whereas the later Ionian Philosophers reached the idea of an ultimate principle attributing to these properties which are suitable to immaterial beings. Thus THALES defined: "νοῦν τοῦ κόσμου τὸν θεόν",<sup>19</sup> ANAXIMANDER proceeded to a most amazing conception of the idea of deity when he clearly expressed the differentiation between the Limit and the Unlimited, and through their definition he strove to grasp the main property of the deity with respect to created beings, that is, the "ἀθάνατον" and its synonym "ἀνώλεθρον".<sup>20</sup> PYTHAGORAS from a different point of view, based however upon the Orphic mystic theology, arrived at the identity of the abstract Oneness.

of God with the intelligible divine monad, and distinguished the latter from the numerical one. JUSTIN the MARTYR in a work of doubtful authenticity analyses this very important point;<sup>21</sup> he says that the monad according to PYTHAGORAS is the essence of all numbers as God is the essence and the origin of all beings. Of course the idea of One God that surpasses every name and form is introduced by XENOPHANES, who by ARISTOTLE'S evidence, firstly used the verb "ἐνίζω" in order to express the Oneness of God.<sup>22</sup> This usage leads toward ST. GREGORY, who furthermore used the same term in <sup>the</sup> passive voice (sc. "ἐνιζεσθαί") in order to define the homocousion of the three Hypostaseis of God; he also invented the verb "ἐνιζεσθαί" in proportion with the above to express the distinction of Hypostaseis without intermission.<sup>23</sup> Among the physicist Philosophers of the fifth century, HERACLETUS saw through the unique order<sup>24</sup> of all creation the existence of one ultimate principle, the origin and point of departure of the entire universe.<sup>25</sup> The theme of the order of the Universe was later on further developed by PLATO and The Neoplatonists, in a way that the coexistence of creation with the deity was approved and thus a kind of divine Law was introduced, in great favour with EMPEDOCLES.<sup>26</sup> The final conclusion to this long spiritual process has been the critical view of the legal religion by the Classical Tragedy, which made clear the idea of One Ultimate god a being in himself, who created, holds and governs the Universe.<sup>27</sup>

Apart from the above-mentioned monotheistic conception of deity, presented briefly in a coherent and hereditary system of religion and thought, we shall deal in turn with ST. GREGORY'S writings, since

we have to see his interpretation of the dogmatic form "Μονὰς ἑν  
Τριῶν - Τριὰς ἑν Μονάδι" respectively, and its penetra-  
tion into Greek patristic thought in subsequent centuries. We must  
also explain what is commonly called 'monotheism of the greatest Greek  
Philosophers' and how it compares with some relevant aspects of  
ST. GREGORY'S achievements on the same subject.

## CHAPTER IV

### HOLY TRINITY - CREATION

We have stressed in the previous chapter some aspects of the ancient Greek religion and philosophy and their final conflation into a monotheistic conception of deity. Having begun with observation of the visible world firstly the Ionian Physic-Philosophers turned the attention to finding out the origin of the perceptible creation; thus they were precursors for the following brilliant centuries, especially with reference to cosmological ideas, viz. the conception of the One Creator and his relation with his creation. In the last <sup>analysis</sup> the coeternity of God with creation was the main interpretative tendency of Greek philosophy, where the Demiurge and Maker of Universe was always Demiurge and there was no time when he was not such.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, Christian tradition, although it exhibits clear parallels to this theory, even as early as the rise of the Apologists, sets out to develop its own Christian insights which add depth and precision.

To begin with, two passages from ST. GREGORY's writings which apparently seem to be at a slight variance, as the ancient Fathers themselves had noticed quite early on, raise the problem of the relation between God and His Creation, especially since their context supplies a variety of philosophical terms. Therefore ST. GREGORY's texts must be quoted in order to facilitate a close comparison between these two passages and with the Greek

philosophical tradition as well. The first passage belongs to the third theological oration and the other to the third Pacific one.

These two passages run as follows:

- (a) "διὰ τοῦτο μονὰς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς εἰς δυνάδα κινή-  
θεισα, μέχρι Τριάδος ἔστιν".<sup>2</sup>
- (b) "Μονάδος μὲν κινήσεως διὰ τὸ πλούσιον,  
δυνάδος δὲ ὑπερβαθείσης. (ὥστε γὰρ τὴν ὕλην καὶ  
τὸ εἶδος), ἔξ ὧν τὰ σώματα, Τριάδος δὲ ὁριοθεί-  
σης διὰ τὸ τέλειον".<sup>3</sup>

ST. MAXIMUS the Confessor was the first commentator who on behalf of the Archbishop of Cyzikos, on the occasion of the interpretation of some passages of ST. GREGORY's works, tried to refute the Origenistic view about the primary unity of all beings within God.<sup>4</sup> ST. MAXIMUS speaks of the only apparent inconsistency and exhorts his Archbishop friend to extract the true conformity of the above quoted passages by the claim that: "οὐκ ἔστιν κατ' ἐν-  
νοίαν τούτων τῶν φωνῶν ἐνικωτέραν εὐρεῖν"<sup>5</sup>, since the expressions "ὑπερβαίνει τὴν δυνάδα (the dyad to be surpassed)" and "μὴ σῆναι μέχρι δυνάδος" (the "μονὰς" not to find its rest in Duality) are identical, as well as the expressions "ὁριοθεῖναι τὴν Τριάδα" (the Triad to be defined) and "μέχρι τῆς Τριάδος σῆναι" (the monad to find its rest in the Triad). Defending ST. GREGORY, ST. MAXIMUS acknowledges this identity by putting forward the term "μοναρχία", and explaining it in accordance with ST. GREGORY's teaching, which



rests on the monarchy among the Persons of the Holy Trinity as contrasted to the error of Sabellian personalism. This monarchy is not "ἀφιλότιμος" (ὡς ἐνὶ προσώπῳ περιγεγραμμένην)<sup>6</sup>, i.e. ambitious, as SABELLIUS suggested when he admitted a Trinity as a three-fold manifestation of one Divine Essence, and thereby emphasized the divine Unity as a Greek philosopher.<sup>7</sup> On this view each Person manifests in succession the common essence, and acts as an absolute monarch. Thus, Greek monotheism undergoes a trinitarian expansion ("ὁλατυσμός") as a further evolution along Greek monotheist Jewish lines. This is especially typified by the Arian heresy<sup>8</sup> which, as ST. ATHANASIUS had already observed, represented a return to the Greek notion of the highest Oneness<sup>9</sup> in defiance of the Trinitarian data of Holy Economy.

As C. BIGG<sup>10</sup> found out, even in NUMENIUS the Trinity is not clear and consistent, because the One is the Anima mundi, where the mundus is a dyad since it has both soul and "δυμός".<sup>11</sup> Of course ST. MAXIMUS' interpretation of ST. GREGORY's aforementioned texts is the exact opposite, because he disclaims any dualism. Like ST. GREGORY, he uses the term "μοναρχία" in order to confess the ultimate principle focussing rather on its energy which prompts our knowledge than on its knowledge as it is in itself; in this way, he avoids and transcends not only the abstract philosophical notion of the noetic but also that of a noetic Triad which exhibits a gradual descent and is threatened with a fall into lower levels ad infinitum (unlimited). To speak briefly, ST. GREGORY's meaning of the term "μοναρχία" is free from any

nuance of either a philosophical "πέρας" (a limited personalism), or of its opposite extreme (a mythological limitlessness), a characteristic element of the Greek religious genealogies. The refutation of this point is given by ST. GREGORY himself in this third theological Oratio as:

"Ἔστι ... καὶ τὸ ἐν ὁτασιάζον πρὸς ἑαυτὸ  
παρὰ καθότασθαι" <sup>12</sup>

Here one may call to mind the nine hypotheses of PLATO'S Parmenides and their elaborate articulation of the absolute One; <sup>13</sup> to be specific, the ultimate Platonic principle, the bonum, which as the absolute one is impossible for the human mind to be perceived, initially becomes "δύλον" in the form of 'The Limit' and 'The Unlimited', which is none other than the 'double series of species' in PLATO'S Sophist. This is on the one hand the idea of the absolute being, the identical with itself (τὸ ταῦτόν) and the cessation, which belong to the category of the "πέρας" (limit), and on the other hand the idea of that which is non-being, that which is at variance with itself ("θάτερον"), which entails the "κίνησις" (motion) and belongs to the category of the unlimited. <sup>14</sup> According to PLATO'S Parmenides the One ("τὸ ἓν") of the first hypothesis "κατακερματίζονται" <sup>15</sup> owing to its fitness ("καίριον") and is manifested as the fullness of the noetic and perceptible species of the absolute being, keeping thus in itself the "πρῶτα κτήματα", <sup>16</sup> the number and the time. <sup>17</sup> In addition we might note that JAMBlichus articulates the realm of the absolute One

(the "παντελὺς ἀρρητον"<sup>18</sup>) in a marvellous scheme. JAMBLICHUS' view is of a paramount importance since he represents the Neoplatonism of ST. GREGORY's days. In this scheme, which has been tabulated by J. M. DILLON,<sup>19</sup> JAMBLICHUS takes for granted the contradiction between the transcendent one (in terms of which we can speak of a negative contemplation applied to ST. GREGORY's view of God who is "πάντων ἐπέκεινα"<sup>20</sup> and who seems to have absolutely nothing in common with creation) and the creative first principle,<sup>21</sup> while PORPHYRY (always according to DAMASCIUS) postulates that the Father of the ultimate noetic Triad is the first principle of all things, "τὴν μίαν τῶν πάντων ἀρχὴν εἶναι τὸν Πατέρα τῆς νοητῆς τριάδος",<sup>22</sup> a statement that we shall have to recall below when the relation among the Persons of the Holy Trinity is to be examined. DAMASCIUS also attributes to JAMBLICHUS the postulation of the "πέρας - αὐτερον" as a dyad between the second one and the noetic realm<sup>23</sup> in general. This theory is close to that which ST. GREGORY calls "δυνάς", or rather "ὑλικὴ δυνάς".<sup>24</sup> In ST. GREGORY's passages which have been quoted above at the very beginning of this chapter the dyad is excluded from the highest divine Principle as the perfection ("τέλειον") is applied only to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Thus it remains for us to search for the relation which exists between JAMBLICHUS' and ST. GREGORY's theological monads since that relation leads to the idea of God who is "πάντων ἐπέκεινα".

In his commentary on PLATO's *Timaeus*, JAMBlichus says that "Every order is presided over by the unparticipated monad, prior to the participated entities, and it is the number which is distinctive of and naturally related to the unparticipated, and from the one is the Dyad".<sup>25</sup> This passage is reminiscent of the Neoplatonic theory of participation of the lower beings in the higher ones, an assumption which derives from the consideration that the higher orders are substantially more perfect than the immediately lower ones. In accordance with these DILLON<sup>26</sup> stresses three 'moments' of each hypostasis:

- (a) The hypostasis in its purest form, as for example in the fragm. 54, which is in opposition to the following;
- (b) The hypostasis as participated in by its lower level of being; and
- (c) The hypostasis as reflected in the lower level of being, which by the term participation ("μετοχή") reflects the very characteristic point of the Greek philosophical thought, in making its final effort at conceiving the unity of the Universe and knowledge of itself.

For this reason subordination was the natural consequence of the 'reasonable' thought of the Greek spirit. For this thought the crucial point was always the logical articulation of "λόγος", as proceeds from one step to the next, under an absolutely strict order and sequence, as ST. GREGORY NEOCAESARIENSIS profoundly

pointed out.<sup>27</sup> On these assumptions all the beings in ancient Greek thought, even that which is "ἐπεκείνα πάντων" might be classified into three levels:

- (a) that which are "ἀμέθεκτα" (unparticipated);
- (b) the "μετέχοντα" (participated); and
- (c) the "ὄντα κατὰ μέθεξιν" or "ἐν σχέσει"<sup>28</sup> (in participation or relation).

This consists of JAMBlichus' schema: "Μονάς - πρόοδος ἐπιστροφή"<sup>29</sup> by which he describes the noetic world ("πρῶτος διάκοσμος") and the world coming into being, the secondary creation ("δεύτερος διάκοσμος"). In JAMBlichus the crucial point remains the unique consideration of the noetic world and the secondary creation which constitutes the immediate reflection of the first. It is easy to certify from this how simple it would be for a neoplatonist to talk, in the days of the Cappadocian Fathers, about the ontological process of emanation to express simultaneously the ontological relationship of the created and the Creator.<sup>30</sup> For this<sup>reason</sup> the esoteric relation of these two realities is a problem of interpretation of both. JAMBlichus is explicit of this relation:

"καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἐννεὰς ἔχει πρὸς τὴν μονάδα συγγένειαν, ἐν γένον ὄνσα, καὶ ἡ δεκάς πρὸς τὴν δαδά, κύβος ἀπ' αὐτῆς ὄνσα, καὶ ἡ εἰκοσιεπτάς πρὸς τὴν τριάδα διὰ τὴν ὁμοίαν αἵτιαν"<sup>31</sup>.

On the other hand, ST. GREGORY excludes any idea of equation of the Holy Trinity with creation which has its origin in the material Dyad,<sup>32</sup> since creation has no ontological connection with the Persons of the perfect ("τελεία") Holy Trinity. The whole problem is related to the Arian controversy where the Son is understood in terms of a "δυνας"<sup>34</sup> occupying second place in the Trinity, as in the Origenistic system. For ST. ATHANASIUS also the creation has its origin in the material dyad, while the Holy Trinity was always a Triad, an argument by which ST. ATHANASIUS defends the divinity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit as well.<sup>35</sup> ST. GREGORY's phrasology falls in line with that of ST. ATHANASIUS especially when he deals with soteriological matters. That which characterizes creation in contrast to its Creator is its composite origin<sup>36</sup> from "εἶδος" and "ὑλη" as "πάν τὸ ἐνυλον, εἰ καὶ τὸ ἀπλουν ἔχει καὶ μονοειδές, καὶ εἰ πρὸς τὰ παχυμερέστερα οὕτως νομίζεται, ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάδι θεωρεῖται. ἔχει γὰρ τὸ ὑλικὸν ὑποκείμενον καὶ τὸ εἶδος. Πάν γὰρ κτίσμα ἐξ ὕλης καὶ εἶδους".<sup>37</sup> It is amazing to note that in the Neoplatonic JAMBlichus alike we find a parallel to this aspect. We may firstly quote a very important passage which reflects an inner relation between the One as a religious principle and the material Dyad, which is characterized by motion and change.

"Ἀπολείπεται δὲ μόνη σχήματος ἁμοιρος καὶ ἐν τρισὶ ὅροις καὶ ἐν ἀναλογίᾳ ὅρι-

ομοῦ τινος ἡ δὴ δὴς ὑπάρχουσα ἀντίξους τε  
καὶ ἑναντιωτάτη παρὰ πάντας τοὺς ἐν ἀρι-  
θμῷ ὄρους τῇ μονάδι, ὡς ἕλη θεῷ καὶ  
σῶμα σώματι, ἀρχὴ τε καὶ πνυμένη ὡσα-  
νεί τῆς τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ ἑτεροειδείας κατ'ἐξῆρα ἕλης, ἀντιδια-  
στέλλομένη παρὰ πᾶσι τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ φύσει κατὰ τὸ αὐτὴν  
μὲν τῆς μεταπτώσεως καὶ μεταβολῆς ἐμπορητικὴν τοῖς οὖσι  
νομίζεσθαι, τὸν δὲ θεὸν ταυτότητος καὶ ἀμεταπτώτου δια-  
μονῆς. "Εν μὲν οὖν ἑκάστῳ τι καὶ ὁ κόσμος κατὰ τὴν ἐναρ-  
τῶ φησικὴν καὶ σημαντικὴν μονάδα, διαίρετόν. δὲ πάλιν ἑκά-  
στον, καθ' ὅσον καὶ ἀναγκαίως καὶ ὑλικῆς μονάδος μετέσχε" 38

Furthermore, it is necessary, beyond any doubt, to quote a

passage of ST. GREGORY's twentieth Oratio putting it here side by  
side with that Jamblichian formulation about the unity of God. In  
this, ST. GREGORY explains the reasons on account of which God is  
one and identical with Himself. This text, which will be treated  
later on in order that the homocousion of the three divine  
Hypostaseis might be proved, runs as follows:

" Τηροῖτο δ' ἄν, ὡς ὁ ἑμὸς λόγος, εἷς ὁ θεός, εἷς  
ἐν ἅτιον καὶ νοῦ καὶ πνεύματος ἀναφερομένων,  
οὐ συντιθεμένων οὐδὲ συναλειφομένων καὶ κατὰ  
τὸ ἐν καὶ ταῦτο τῆς θεότητος, ἵν' οὕτως ὀνομάσω, κίνη-  
μά τε καὶ βούχημα καὶ τὴν τῆς οὐσίας ταυτότητα" 39

It is obvious that in both cases ontological stability and  
identity may be applied only to God, and although at first sight



the texture of the afore-quoted Iamblichian passage might cause some surprise, nevertheless it would be necessary to study a specific usage of Greek philosophical ideas by ST. GREGORY in order to establish the character of the similarities.

For IAMBlichus the "ὕλη δυνάς" is the first hypostasis with an inner and an outer activity, by which the "θεωρία"<sup>40</sup> of the Universe is achieved as generation and transcendence in the same way as PLOTINUS' metaphysics suggest, to which IAMBlichus is indebted for the theory of the double activity.<sup>41</sup> But coming back to our main subject it is not so easy to discern whether the usage "ὕλη δυνάς" is specifically attributed to IAMBlichus or may probably have its derivation from arithmetical theories of Pythagoreans and pythagorizing Neoplatonists according to HIPPOLYTUS' witness, who, according to his contemporary philosophical views, places the origin of the generation of numbers not on the "ἀγέννητος μονάς" but on the "γεννητή δυνάς".<sup>42</sup> Of course a variety of theories with mathematical religious elements was developed during the centuries by the Greek philosophers and so both IAMBlichus and patristic thought are indebted to them.

For example, the regular view of the Greek mathematicians was that the "δύο - δυνάς", but not the "έν" or "μονάς", is the first number; thus ARISTOTLE says that "εὐλόγως οὐκ ἔστι τὸ έν ἀριθμός. οὐδὲ γάρ τὸ μέτρον μέτρα, ἀλλ' ἀρχή καὶ τὸ μέτρον καὶ τὸ έν",<sup>43</sup>

but when he refers to a concrete number he admits that the first number is sometimes the "έν", sometimes the "δυνας". This admixture of arithmetical mysticism with metaphysics was adopted also by PLATO's successors, SPEUSIPPUS and XENOCRATES who identified the "μονάς" with the supreme God.<sup>44</sup> More precisely, AETIUS attributes to PYTHAGORAS himself an arithmetical theology,<sup>45</sup> where the interpretation of dyad is very close to that which is characterized by ST. GREGORY<sup>45</sup> "ὕλική δύνας". AETIUS' relevant passage runs as follows: "Τὴν μονάδα καὶ τὴν ἀόριστον δύαδα (τίθησι sc. PYTHAGORAS) ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς. σπεύδει δὲ αὐτῶ τῶν ἀρχῶν ἡ μὲν (sc. μονάς) ἐπὶ τὸ ποιητικὸν αἴτιον καὶ εἰδικόν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ νοῦς, ὁ θεός, ἡ δὲ (sc. ἀόριστος δύας) ἐπὶ τὸ παθητικόν<sup>46</sup> τε καὶ ὕλικόν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὁ δρασὶς κόσμος<sup>47</sup>".

It is obvious that the phrasology is alike in both traditions, but ST. GREGORY's purpose is to define the distinction of creation from the Holy Trinity. This was not an accidental event or a mere intellectual speculation, but an ecclesiastical necessity. For ST. GREGORY, as for his commentator ST. MAXIMUS<sup>48</sup> the Confessor, the refutation of Origenism was of a paramount importance with respect to defending the reality of the divine being and created motion. So ST. MAXIMUS, by reason of <sup>the prevailing</sup> misinterpretation of some of ST. GREGORY's passages, proceeds to defend an optimistic contemplation of the whole Universe and to consider the ontological motion as: (a) a result of the creative activity of God; (b) the means by which the believer may be elevated to God. This means that the

Origenist theory about the motion must be excluded from the Trinitarian dogma.

According to Origen, who follows the lines of the Platonic tradition, the material world was formed by the "ἐνὰς τῶν λογικῶν, ἡ τις κόρον λαβούσα τῆς ἐν τῷ θεῷ μονιμότητος ἐμερίσθη, καὶ τῷ οἰκείῳ σκεδασμῷ τὴν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου γένεσιν συνεισῆγεν"<sup>49</sup>  
 It means that motion was the active principle when the material creation took place, and that this motion which separates creation from God, as an expression of an ontological failure in the spiritual realm. On the contrary ST. MAXIMUS tries to absolve ST. GREGORY from the blame that the latter followed Origen's Trinitarian and cosmological doctrine, especially the theory about the pre-existence of the spiritual beings and souls within the consubstantial unity of God, a kind of pantheism, which entails at least an endless humiliation and exaltation of the deity itself.<sup>50</sup> It seems quite sure that ST. MAXIMUS is aware of the consequences of the Origenist system and for this reason deals with ST. GREGORY's ambiguous passages especially that one of Or. 23.8, which simultaneously contains<sup>both</sup> Trinitarian and cosmological elements. The crucial point of this afore-quoted<sup>51</sup> passage is the meaning of the "κίνησις" (the ontological motion) of the Monad, as one might still suppose an antinomy between the ontological motion and the supreme Monad, inasmuch as the "κίνησις" is a characteristic "ἰδίωμα" of creation, which is subject to evolution, change and time. For a

satisfactory understanding of this antinomy only ST. GREGORY's evidence might help towards a solution to the problem.

Above all, mention must be made of ST. GREGORY's views as they can be determined from the rest of his writings. Thus in Oratio 34, In Aegyptiorum adventum, he returns to his beloved theme, namely the meaning of the divine Principle - Monarchy. This passage is very important because here the definition of the constitution of the divine Monarchy is investigated in conjunction with the entire creation.

ST. GREGORY classifies the "ὄντα" (without distinguishing precisely the "ὄντως ὄντα" from the "ὄντα") into two different realities,<sup>52</sup> Majesty and Service, which is in accordance with the distinction of their nature.<sup>53</sup> So, that which is First is "ὑπὲρ τὴν φύσιν"<sup>54</sup> and above time, while the latter exists with us, since this is created, and subject to change. In turn ST. GREGORY recognizes that the former is called God and subsists in three "τοῖς μετὰ τῷ Θεῷ", namely, the Cause, the Creator and the Perfector: "τῷ Πατρὶ λέγω" (sc. ST. GREGORY talks and confesses), and "τῷ υἱῷ", and "τῷ ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι", whereas the other reality is called creation ("κτίσις") in general, "καὶ ἄλλα (sc. κτίσματα) ἄλλων ὑπεραίρη", according to the proportion of their nearness to God.<sup>55</sup> Without doubt, ST. GREGORY's statement is very important, for he explicitly stresses the absolute difference by nature between God and Creation.<sup>56</sup> In comparison the properties of each one of these two realities may be tabulated clearly as follows:

A. PROPERTIES

I GOD above nature creative original immovable

MASTERY above time ποιητική ἀρχική ἀκίνητος

Αἴτιος } Πατήρ  
 Δημιουργός } Υἱός  
 Τελειοποιός } Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα

II CREATION with us created subject changing

SERVICE subject to time πεποιημένη ὑπὸ χεῖρα μεταπίπτουσα

B. DEFINITIONS

I MASTERY: "τῶν πάντων διαιρετῶν ἐνικωτέρα, τῶν τελείως μοναδικῶν ἀφθονωτέρα"

II SERVICE: "Ἀλλὰ ἄλλων ὃ περαίνει κατὰ τὴν ἀνα-  
λογία τῆς πρὸς θεὸν ἑγγύτητος".<sup>57</sup>

Of course in the pagan world as well as in Patristic thought theology, as "λόγος" about the first Principles or God, and cosmology, as "λόγος" about the origin of created beings universally, seem to have a close link. As E. P. MEIJERING<sup>58</sup> pointed out, this was a serious intention in ST. ATHANASIUS, ST. GREGORY's great precursor, as one gathers from the "Contra Gentes". In their efforts the Fathers of the fourth century dealt with the problem of a clear conception of Creation by clarifying the meaning of "becoming" and "being" which was a central issue in the Arian Controversy.<sup>59</sup> Firstly, Origen, having accepted the Greek theory about the Bonus Demiurgus and the absolute perfection of God, went

on to postulate the "ἀίδιονς" of the Universe, since he felt that he had to reject the alternative notion of a changing God.<sup>60</sup> Only in ST. ATHANASIUS, and after him in the Cappadocian tradition, was the clear distinction between the divine and <sup>creaturaly</sup> realities elucidated. Essentially it was by the Incarnation of the Son Himself, who is God as the Father, that the distinction was overcome <sup>without being abolished.</sup> This was a new notion quite distinct from the Neoplatonic one resting on inferior principles, which interfere between God and Man as representatives of the created world.<sup>61</sup> Besides, ST. ATHANASIUS is clearly and uncompromisingly in opposition to ORIGEN's concept of genesis. We would say that in this point ORIGEN is close to the Aristotelian doctrine on the eternity ("ἀίδιονς") of the world. As G. FLOROVSKY<sup>62</sup> underlined, this leads his followers to reject ORIGEN's conclusion that ultimately the world is not created. For example, ARIUS rejected the eternity of the world in order to prove the temporal character of everything generated and therefore to hold that the Son's genesis has occurred within time. It is obvious that the Greek Philosophy and the Patristic thought of the first centuries alike were always concerned with the "first principles".<sup>63</sup> Furthermore, ST. GREGORY and the non-Cappadocian Fathers emphasised the heterogeneity of the created beings and God and insisted decisively on the homoeousion of generation. Thus they interpreted the existence of the creation as a result of will and volition in opposition to generation which is dependent upon consubstantiality.<sup>64</sup> The origin of this interpretation belongs again to ST. ATHANASIUS who first made the crucial

distinction between "οὐσία" and "βούλησις" insisting that "γέννησις" is always "κατὰ φύσιν", whereas creation has its origin in God's "βούλησις".<sup>65</sup> The conclusion is far-reaching; any ontological coalescence of God and world is impossible and excluded. On this assumption ST. GREGORY paves the way for the Chalcedonian definition, as he claims that in Christ each of His two natures keeps its specific property,<sup>66</sup> in accordance with the decision of the second Ecumenical Council against Apollinarianism. The Alexandrian tradition expounded the Incarnation on the same lines, in contrast to a certain docetism embedded in Antiochene theology, and insisted on the real Incarnation of the Logos.<sup>67</sup>

ST. BASIL, as ST. GREGORY, used the schema of Mastery and Service to denote the creative and created "ὄντα" in order to prove the divinity of the Holy Spirit and His distinction from the world.<sup>68</sup> It is note-worthy that the classification of the beings ("ὄντα") into 'created' and 'uncreated' things is common to all Patristic thought and may be regarded as the ultimate distinction between Greek pagan and Christian thought.<sup>69</sup> Employing similar language, ST. JOHN DAMASCENUS summarizes his previous Patristic thought under the general rubric "πάντα τὰ ὄντα ἢ κτιστὰ ἔστιν, ἢ ἀκτιστὰ".<sup>70</sup>

Although there is a strict distinction between God and the created world, nevertheless the latter is subjected to change for the better "τὴν εἰς τὸ κρεῖττον μεταβολήν".<sup>71</sup> Of course this change is dependent upon the presuppositions that the



universal world, either the perceptible or the imperceptible one, has been created from nothing ("ἐξ οὐκ ὧν τῶν ") by God and that it is governed by the divine Providence<sup>72</sup> of a personal Creator ("Θημιουργός").<sup>73</sup> It is indisputable that in this passage the unique and undivided divine energy and power defines successively the presence of the divine Hypostaseis within the mystery of the divine Dispensation,<sup>in</sup> exactly the same<sup>way</sup> as in the above-quoted passage Or. 34.8 P.G. 36.248D-249A, where the Father is mentioned as the ultimate Cause ("ἀίτιος"), the Son as the Creator ("Θημιουργός") and the Holy Spirit the Perfector ("τελείοποιός") of the world. This does not mean that the dispensational manifestation of the Holy Trinity entails an abolition of the Trinitarian character of God before the beginning of the Divine Dispensation. The Holy Trinity was always the Trinity of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. From this perspective time ("χρόνος") distinguishes the created beings from God,<sup>74</sup> but at the same time it must be underlined that time characterizes creation, the fall and the salvation following upon the Incarnation of the Son. This means that the Holy Dispensation, in opposition to the Greek Philosophical interpretation of the Universe, is of a bipolar reality; in this time characterizes on the one hand the first moment of creation, the moment of the "fiat", when the pre-existent will ("βουλήσις") of God is hypostasized in the created world, created out of nothing ("ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος"), and on the other hand the final moment ("τὸ ἔσχατον") in a reverse order, whereupon time will be replaced by the eternity of the Eighth Day.

The justification of such an interpretation belongs to ST. GREGORY himself; by analyzing the appellation "ὁ ὢν", which God Himself revealed to Moses,<sup>75</sup> he says that the "ἦν" and "ἐσται", namely the past and the future, are elements ("τμήματα")<sup>76</sup> of our time, whereas God is always ("ὢν ἀεί"), since His essence ("τὸ εἶναι") is utterly transcendent of concept, time and nature: "πᾶσαν ὑπερ-εκπῖπτον ἐννοίαν καὶ χρόνον καὶ φύσεως".<sup>77</sup>

On this principle the Incarnation of the Son is the most powerful weapon against the doctrine of "ἀνακύκλωσις" of Greek philosophy, which must be utterly excluded from Christian belief. This was the reason for APOLLINARIUS' condemnation, since his heresy left space for the reintroduction of "ἀνακύκλωσις" into cosmic time and consequently the Incarnation could have been an event of circular repetitions.<sup>78</sup> Of course the way to this extreme had been paved earlier by ARIUS who "εἰς δουλείαν κατὰ γὰρ τὴν δεσποτείαν, καὶ μετὰ τῆς κτίσεως τιθεῖς τὴν ἀκτιστον φύσιν καὶ ὑπέρχρονον"<sup>79</sup> established his cosmology on philosophical premises.

ST. GREGORY does employ the notion of circular time ("κυκλικὸς χρόνος"), borrowed from Greek Philosophy and particularly from Stoic tradition, but as D. TSAMES<sup>80</sup> pointed out, in ST. GREGORY the "κυκλικὸς χρόνος" obtains two new meanings by which the Greek view is subjected to essential change. Thus, (a) the Christian cosmology was cleared from the Origenistic theory about the perennially repeated falls of the created beings;

cosmic time is distinguished from the eternity of God and the Stoic theory about the repetition of the same events, on which Origen had based his cosmological system, is refuted especially after the Arian controversy;<sup>81</sup> (b) the conception of the circular motion ("κυκλική κίνησις")<sup>82</sup> had been used to characterize everything unstable and changeable.<sup>83</sup> Furthermore, the biblical week in the O.T. (Genesis), in comparison with the week of historical time, defines the bounds of the universal world, which longs for its fulfilment in the fullness of time and the transcendence of time by the introduction of the eighth day, the day of the Resurrected Christ and the coming of the Kingdom of God.<sup>84</sup> On this basis the vicious circle of historical time is abolished, without leaving creation to be destroyed by entering into an insatiable and endless fullness which is followed by a fall opposed to it. From this viewpoint, only the Incarnation of God, who assumed the created human being, can free man from his bondage and the vicious circle of his own idolatry.<sup>85</sup> In fact, what preserves the core of all previous interpretation is summarized in the Christological presuppositions since the Patristic, and especially that of ST. GREGORY's conception about the relation between the Holy Trinity and Creation, is finally to be interpreted in complete harmony with the Mystery of the Holy Dispensation throughout the ages, now and for ever.

In ST. GREGORY's doctrine which has just been touched upon, the "κίνησις" which characterizes the "μεταπλήττουσα κτίσις",

must be totally excluded from the "ἀκίνητος δεσποτεία".

Yet, we have drawn attention to ST. GREGORY's particular phrase:

" διὰ τοῦτο μὴ ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς εἰς δυνάδα κίνηθετα "86

which evidently seems to assume at least a kind of motion within the Holy Trinity. Does this represent an entirely different aspect from the above-mentioned conclusion? The point at issue seems to have occupied ST. GREGORY's commentators quite early. Firstly, it is appropriate to refer to the discussion between a monk and ST. BARSANUPHIUS the Bishop of Gaza, on the pre-existence of the matter ("ὕλη") before the creation of man. The monk had asked ST. BARSANUPHIUS for spiritual help in order to comprehend the crucial point of some heretical ideas of ORIGEN, DIDYMUΣ and EVAERIUS. In the development of their theological dialogue the monk put forward some passages of ST. GREGORY's Orations with the hint that they might have suggested Origenism and thereby casting a shadow of doubt on ST. GREGORY's orthodoxy.

In answer to the monk's insinuations against ST. GREGORY's orthodoxy, Abbot BARSANUPHIUS at first advised him in an ascetical way,<sup>87</sup> that God claims from monks only " ἁγιασμός, κάθαρσις, σωπὴ καὶ ταπείνωσις "88 and secondly he admitted the limitation of human knowledge, even for the Saints. As for himself, ST. BARSANUPHIUS says rather dramatically that he prefers to be drawn into the silence which results from the vision of Holiness.<sup>89</sup> Finally, he concludes by attributing to God<sup>90</sup> his answer.

Of course this conversation is historically connected with the most intense period of the Origenistic controversies in the days of JUSTINIAN's rule,<sup>91</sup> when ST. GREGORY's doctrine was decisively scrutinized to such an extent that ST. MAXIMUS, a subsequent author, felt obliged to defend the Cappadocian Father's orthodoxy. Thus, commenting on the passage which at first sight ST. GREGORY seems to suggest that a motion exists even within the Holy Trinity, ST. MAXIMUS claims that all the matter must be closed in favour of ST. GREGORY by recognizing that the estimation of the characterization of "κίνησις" qualifies <sup>human</sup> a passion rather than the Holy Trinity. His further elucidation of the matter rests on some fundamental philosophical precepts which lie at the root of such a theory, as for instance the revelation of God with respect to His creation. His demonstrative passage deserves to be fully quoted (ST. MAXIMUS' following extract refers to the above-mentioned passages of ST. GREGORY's P.G. 36.16B and P.G. 35.1160C):

"Εἰ δὲ κίνησιν ἀκούσας θαυμάσας πῶς ὑπερ-  
ἀπειρος κινεῖται θεότης, ἡμῶν, οὐκ ἔκείνης τὸ πά-  
θος, πρῶτον τὸν τοῦ εἶναι λόγον αὐτῆς ἑξαμπο-  
μένων, καὶ οὕτω τὸν τοῦ πῶς αὐτὴν ὑφ' ἑστέαναι  
τρόπου φωτιζομένων, εἶπερ τὸ εἶναι τοῦ πῶς εἶ-  
ναι πάντως προεπινοεῖται. Κίνησις οὖν θεότητος ἢ  
δι' ἐκφάνσεως γινομένη περί τε τοῦ εἶναι αὐ-  
τὴν καὶ τοῦ πῶς αὐτὴν ὑφ' ἑστέαναι τοῖς αὐ-  
τῆς δεκτικαῖς κατέστηκε γνῶσις".<sup>92</sup>

ST. GREGORY's expressions were determined by his circumstances and particularly by the Christian reply to the question concerning the "ὄντως ὄντος".<sup>93</sup> ST. MAXIMUS not only perceived this, but entered into an even more profound discussion. For example, he stressed the usage of the infinitive "εἶναι" with the article "το", instead of using the philosophical term "οὐσία", which defines existence as a purely conceptual being. He also used the genitive of the infinitive, "τοῦ πῶς εἶναι", which is alternative to "τοῦ πῶς ὑφ' ἑστέαναι", to denote existence as a single entity, the "μοναδικὴ ὑπόστασις".<sup>94</sup> Making a survey of this passage, the attention must be focussed on ST. MAXIMUS' starting point, namely that the revelatory function of God's "ἐκφανσις" does not leave space for alteration either of "τὸ εἶναι" or "τὸ πῶς αὐτὴν" (viz. the Holy Trinity) "ὑφ' ἑστέαναι". This remarkable statement contains a profound perception of Trinitarian doctrine based on the mystery of the Holy Economy, where "ὁ τοῦ εἶναι λόγος" defines the oneness of God (expressed in an Aristotelian way) and is an alternative to "ὁ λόγος τῆς οὐσίας". The "τρόπος τοῦ πῶς αὐτὴν (sc. θεότητα) ὑφ' ἑστέαναι" refers to the three hypostaseis of the Holy Trinity, inasmuch as "μία θεότης οὐσα τε μοναδικῶς καὶ ὑφ' ἑστέαναι τριαδικῶς".<sup>95</sup> Thus, on the basis of the "λόγος τῶν ὑποστάσεων", God makes Himself known to men through His manifestation to the "δεκτικοί" among them, although even the knowledge of the "δεκτικοί" in the last analysis is but a knowledge "περὶ τοῦ εἶναι", but not a precise definition of

what "τὸ εἶναι" is in itself.<sup>96</sup> In this case the confession that God exists ("εἶναι ") is an " ἀποδείξις εὐσεβοῦς περὶ αὐτῆς (sc. τῆς Τριάδος ) δόξης ",<sup>97</sup> a statement which assumes at least a kind of "κίνησις " in man's movement towards spiritual maturity. On this basis ST. MAXIMUS attempts to expound ST. GREGORY's passages about the motion of the Monad and <sup>the</sup> existence of matter by correlating them to the Mystery of Holy Economy, and by employing the precepts of Greek philosophical dogma, as it had been done previously by many of his predecessors and especially by the Cappadocian Fathers. The consequence thereof was that, in contrast to the Origenistic tradition and as an elaborate articulation of ST. GREGORY's thought, Christian cosmology based upon Christological presuppositions came to be harmonized with belief in the divine infinity; this meant that the tragic abyss between the contingency of creation and the infinity of God, which had been emphasized by Greek philosophy, was overcome by the incarnate God. Thus, the motion which, according to ST. MAXIMUS' interpretation, is a characteristic of the created nature, resulting from the creative activity of God, continues its movement "within God" whereby creation finds its wholeness and rests for ever. This achievement finds its justification in God's unlimitedness and ultimately means that the motion of Creation is impossible to cease without a transition from one change to another:

" πάντα τὰ ὄντα καθ' ὃν μὲν ὑπέστησαν τε καὶ εἶσι λόγον, στάσιμά τε παντελῶς εἶσι καὶ ἀκίνητα, τῷ δὲ τῶν περὶ αὐτὰ θεωρουμένων λόγῳ, καθ' ὃν ἡ τοῦ παν-



τὸς τοῦτου σαφῶς οἰκονομία συνέστηκε τε καὶ δε-  
ξάγεται, πάντα κινεῖται δηλονότι καὶ ἀστατεῖ".<sup>98</sup>

This passage has an inner relation with another one, whereby ST. MAXIMUS, in the light of ST. GREGORY's definitions tabulated above on p. 86, uses Aristotelian logic to prove the impossibility of two ultimate Principles, namely God and matter. He also employs the Aristotelian theory that " τὸ πρῶτον κινῶν ἀκίνητον αὐτό",<sup>99</sup> which seems to have been employed by ST. GREGORY as well in the above-mentioned schema on p. 86, where God's properties are "ποιητική", "ἀρχική" and "ἀκίνητος", in respect always to creation. ST. MAXIMUS' painful attempt to defend ST. GREGORY's Trinitarian doctrine from some particular questions, which seem to have been raised by some monkish sects, proves that Origenism had survived even after its condemnation by the Fifth Ecumenical Council.<sup>100</sup> The logical articulation in this very important passage, the main purpose of which is to prove that the entire Holy Trinity is "ἀρχική" and that the "κίνησις" applies only to creation can be analyzed as follows:

Syllogism I

A. Πάν ὃ ἦν οὐ γέγονε

B. Εἰ ἡ ὕλη ἦν

---

C. Ἡ ὕλη οὐ γέγονε

Syllogism II

A. Πᾶν ὃ μὴ γέγονε οὐδὲ κινεῖται

B. Εἰ ἡ ὕλη οὐ γέγονε

---

C. Ἡ ὕλη οὐδὲ κινεῖται

Syllogism III

A. Πᾶν ὃ μὴ κινεῖται οὐδὲ τοῦ εἶναι ἡρξάτο

B. Εἰ ἡ ὕλη οὐ κινεῖται

---

C. Ἡ ὕλη οὐδὲ τοῦ εἶναι ἡρξάτο

Syllogism IV

A. Πᾶν ὃ μὴ τοῦ εἶναι ἡρξάτο πάντως ἀναρχόν ἐστι

B. Εἰ ἡ ὕλη τοῦ εἶναι οὐκ ἡρξάτο

---

C. Ἡ ὕλη πάντως ἀναρχός ἐστι

Syllogism V

A. Πᾶν ὃ ἀναρχον ἀπειρόν ἐστι

B. Εἰ ἡ ὕλη ἀναρχός ἐστι

---

C. Ἡ ὕλη ἀπειρός ἐστι

Syllogism VI

A. Πάν ὃ ἄπειρον πάντως καὶ ἀκίνητον (ἀκίνητον γὰρ πάντως τὸ ἄπειρον, οὐ γὰρ ἔχει ποῦ κινηθεῖναι τὸ μὴ ὀριζόμενον).

B. Εἰ ἡ ὕλη ἀπειρός ἐστὶ

---

C. Ἡ ὕλη πάντως ἀκίνητος ἐστὶ

On the basis of the above syllogism, if the "ὕλη" rightly had been characterized as "ἀναρχος", "ἀπειρος", "ἀκίνητος", which are properties of God, the next syllogism and the final one following after it would be valid and not antinomic.

Syllogism VII

A. Ὁ θεὸς ἐστὶν ἀναρχος, ἀπειρος, ἀκίνητος

B. Εἰ ἡ ὕλη ἐστὶν ἀναρχος, ἀπειρος, ἀκίνητος

---

C. θεὸς καὶ ὕλη εἰσὶν ἄναρχα, ἀπειρα, ἀκίνητα.

Syllogism VIII [Antinomy]

A. Ἐν ἐστὶ τὸ ἀναρχον, ἀπειρον, ἀκίνητον

B. Εἰ θεὸς καὶ ὕλη εἰσὶν ἄναρχα, ἀπειρα, ἀκίνητα

---

C. Δύο ἐστὶ πάντως τὰ ἀπειρα καὶ ἀναρχα καὶ ἀκίνητα, θεὸς καὶ ὕλη, ὅπερ ἀμήχανον.

Of course the antinomy of the final syllogism is the consequence of the premiss that the ultimate Principle must be only one. This was an achievement of Greek philosophy, and thus we have

already established a kind of monotheism in the Greek world.<sup>101</sup>  
But the problem of interpreting the "ὄντα" remains, granted that the understanding is different. So coming back to the point at issue, we can say that for the Greek philosophers the hierarchical gradation of the Universe with a highest Cause on top<sup>the</sup> was the basis whereon they framed their speculation, in such a way that through a continuous succession of higher series then would arrive at something absolutely unchangeable, from which in reverse order all the beings are derived. This is the famous "χρυσή σείρα" (golden series) of the orphic poetry, a theme that has been commented<sup>upon</sup> by the Greek philosophers, especially the Neoplatonists, and which also occurs in ST. GREGORY.

It is necessary here to quote the relevant passages in order to see clearly the crucial point which differentiates Christian belief from the pagan one, since the wording is somewhat the same in both cases, as it is probably obvious. The first three passages come from the Orphic Poetry and have been incorporated into PROCLUS' works.

I PROCL. in Tim. II.95E (E. ABEL, Frag. Orph. 121)

" Ἀντάρ ἑπὶν δεσμὸν κρατερόν περὶ πᾶσι τανύσσης  
σειρήν χρυσεῖν ἑξ ἀθέρος ἀρτήσαντα".

" Εἰ τοίνυν ὁ Ζεὺς ἔστιν ὁ τὸ ἐν κράτος ἔχων, ὁ τὸν  
φάνητα καταπιὼν, ἔν ᾧ πρῶτως αἶ νονται  
τῶν ὄλων αἰτίαι, ὁ πάντα παράγων κατὰ τὰς ὑπο-

θήκας τῆς νυκτός, ὃ τοῖς θεοῖς τὰς ἑξουσίας παρα-  
δίδους, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ποιητὴς, πέμπτῃν ἔχων ἐν τοῖς  
βασιλευσὶ τάξιν, ὥς ἀποδέδεικται τῷ ἡμετέρῳ καθ-  
ηγεμόνι ἐν ταῖς ὀρφικαῖς συνονομασίαις".

II PROCLUS in Tim. III.146E (E. ABEL, Frag. Orph. 121, p. 101)

"Καὶ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κρατερός δεσμός, ὡς φη-  
σιν θεολόγος (sc. Ὀρφεύς), διὰ πάντων τεταμένος καὶ  
ὑπὸ τῆς χρυσῆς σειρᾶς συνεχόμενος.  
Ὡς αὐτῷ γὰρ ὁ Ζεὺς τὴν χρυσὴν ὑφίστησι  
σειρὰν κατὰ τὰς ὑποθήκας τῆς νυκτός".

III PROCLUS in Tim. III.173E (E. ABEL, Frag. Orph. 122, p. 201)

"Κρατερός μὲν γὰρ καὶ ὁ δεσμός ὁ  
ἀπὸ νοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς, ὡς καὶ Ὀρφεύς φησιν,  
ἀλλὰ μείζων ἢ τῆς χρυσῆς σειρᾶς ἔνωσης καὶ  
μειζόνων τοῖς πᾶσι ἀγαθῶν ἀίτια".

IV ST. GREGORY, Or. 31, 28 (Theol. V) P.G. 36, 164C-165A

"Ἐχω μὲν οὕτω περὶ τούτων καὶ ἔχοιμι  
καὶ ὅστις ἐμοὶ φίλος, σέβειν θεὸν τὸν πατέρα,  
θεὸν τὸν υἱόν, θεὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τρεῖς  
ἰδιότητας θεότητα μίαν, δόξην καὶ τιμὴν καὶ οὐ-  
σίαν καὶ βασιλείαν μὴ μεριζομένην, ὥς τις τῶν

μικρῶ πρόσθεν θεοφόρων ἐφιλοσόφησεν. ἢ  
 "μή ἴδιοι ἑωσφόρον ἀνατέλλοντα", ὡς ρησιν ἢ  
 γραφή, μηδὲ δόξαν τῆς ἐκείθεν λαμπρότητος, ὅ-  
 τις οὕτως ἔχει ἢ συμφέρεται τοῖς καιροῖς, ἄλ-  
 λοτε ἄλλος γενόμενος καὶ περὶ τῶν μεγίστων  
 σαθρῶς βουλευόμενος. Εἰ μὲν γάρ οὐδὲ προσ-  
 κυνητόν, πῶς ἔμὲ θεοῖ δια τοῦ βαπτίσματος; εἰ δὲ  
 προσκυνητόν, πῶς οὐ σεπτόν; Εἰ δὲ σεπτόν,  
 πῶς οὐ θεός; Ἐν ἡρτῆται τοῦ ἑνός, ἢ χρυσῇ τις  
ὄντως σειρά καὶ σωτήριος. Καὶ παρὰ μὲν τοῦ  
 Πνεύματος ἡμῶν ἢ ἀναγέννησις, παρὰ δὲ τῆς ἀναγεν-  
 νήσεως ἢ ἀνάωλασις, παρὰ δὲ τῆς ἀνασώσεως ἢ ἐπί-  
 γνωσις τῆς ἀβίας τοῦ ἀνασώσαντος<sup>4</sup>.

It must be noted right at the start that none of ST. GREGORY's commentators, ancient or modern, has observed the similarity between ST. GREGORY's expressions and the expressions of the Orphic tradition. Among his modern commentators, MASON, who dealt with this passage, seems to ignore completely the well-established use of the phrase " χρυσῇ σειρά " by the pagan Philosophers. He comments that this phrase is "in rough apposition to "<sup>ci</sup>ἑν" . It is difficult to decide between this reading and " χρυσῆς " which has the authority of the best MS. The pronunciation being identical, it seems natural to choose the rarer word; but on the other hand the scribe of "a" may have been thrown out by the somewhat unusual combination of " ἢ " with " τις " Cp.ii 19 " ἢ ἀνὴρ τις ὀλίγη ". In fact, from the grammatical point of view, MASON is right, although

he does not eventually arrive at a resolute position. On the other hand, J. GALLAY<sup>102</sup> quotes inappropriately : Iliade 8.19, saying that "c'est vraiment une chaîne d'or et de salut ... cette expression a été commentée par PLATON (Théétète 153<sup>c-d</sup>) qui a voulu y voir le symbole du soleil".

We are of the opinion that ST. GREGORY's passage is close to the Orphic and Neoplatonic tradition since (a) there is not any mention here about the symbolism of the sun and (b) its structure reminds purely something of the above-quoted Orphic extracts. To be precise, apart from identical phras<sup>e</sup>ology, both cases establish an identical interpretative approach common to both PROCLUS as well as ST. GREGORY. In PROCLUS' comment the highest god Zeus, as the first origin of the noetic beings, is the master of his sovereignty, which is of a unique character ("το <sup>1</sup>ἐν κράτος "). In ST. GREGORY the Holy Trinity is only one God, " <sup>1</sup>δὸς <sup>3</sup>η καὶ τιμῇ καὶ οὐσίᾳ, καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ μεριζομένῃν ", and this entails the unity of power and energy. In actuality the case of the pagan passage gradually brings to light an abstract articulation in its wording under the necessity of an ultimate and unchangeable unity of all being, whereas in ST. GREGORY's case the God, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit saves the "λόγος" of unity and multiplicity simultaneously without being obliged to turn to mythological solutions. In this case we must observe how profoundly and faithfully Greek philosophical thought kept its initially divine character, working in the "dark" after our original sin! Really this was the greatest and most holy.



achievement, which had been attained by the Greek Philosophers, viz. to serve the Divine Dispensation in such an admirable way. If it is certain that a Triadic God is actually<sup>α</sup> scandalous matter for all Greek thought, nevertheless the Mystery of God for the salvation of the world extends over the ages. On this premise the Holy Economy was the hope of all the world.<sup>103</sup> The argumentation of the Apologists was essentially of such a tendency.

Coming back to ST. GREGORY let us see the meaning of the phrase: "Εν ἡρπύται τοῦ ἐνός, ἡ χρυσὴ τις οὐλὴ σείρα καὶ σωτήριος", which is obviously a common locus in the above-mentioned passages, functioning, however, in a different way in each one of the two cases. In<sup>the</sup> three extracts of the Orphic tradition the "κρατερός δευρός τῆς χρυσεῖς σείρας", which derives from the ultimate Cause, expresses the logical articulation of the Universe under presuppositions of an ontological subordination, perfectly elaborated within the Neoplatonic tradition. In ST. GREGORY, however, the same phrase states only the manifestation of the Holy Trinity through the Mystery of Divine Dispensation. Particularly notable is the soteriological weaving of ST. GREGORY's text, which is explicitly emphasized by the usage of the adjective "σωτήριος" (saving). Furthermore, ST. GREGORY analyses the soteriological consequences to believe in the One God upon whom everything is dependent. At the beginning of his passage ST. GREGORY confesses the divinity of the three Persons of the Holy Trinity defending particularly the divinity of the Holy Spirit since His

function immediately affects Christian life. The order of his argumentation proves that (a) the Holy Spirit is worshipped, and by his appropriation the Christian can be deified by baptism; (b) He is an object of adoration ("σέπτον<sup>1</sup>"); (c) for this reason He is God. Being God, the Holy Spirit can give to men new birth ("ἀναγέννησις"), which is the reality of our new creation and from this comes our knowledge ("ἐπιγνωσις") of the dignity of God who acts to make this creation new. As ST. GREGORY somewhere else points out, the way to have the "ἐπιγνωσις" (deeper knowledge) of God is the manifestation of God the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit who establishes the Church.<sup>104</sup> This is the one and only way of "θεογνωσία", which presupposes a kind of motion from "inside" the Holy Trinity towards man who is elevated up to God the Father after the <sup>divine</sup> ~~latters~~ "κατάβασις" (descent) through the <sup>the</sup> Mystery of Holy Economy. At last the motion belongs only to created nature, which, being motivated by Grace, comes to confess the Holy Trinity, One God in three Hypostaseis.<sup>105</sup>

To sum up we could say that with ST. GREGORY the supreme problem of Greek Philosophy connected with an ultimate Principle, which, being unchangeable, might have availed for interpreting the Universe under fixed and logical premises, has been solved, since man, and with him all created nature, is led to acknowledge the incomprehensibility of God by nature. This is what saves man from the vicious circle of his own reality, and leads to his liberation from the ontological distortion of his original sin which demanded of him to be god or to find a god of his own.

## CHAPTER V

### TRINITARIAN FORMULATION

Returning now to ST. GREGORY'S writings we must <sup>take of</sup> notice a passage from his poem 'De Mundo', where he explicitly and straight-forwardly speaks of the relation which exists between God and creation, refuting simultaneously the Greek philosophical conception of this matter. The development of the theme is announced at the beginning of the aforesaid poem and the style seems to be rather apologetic. Although not very clear at first sight, it is certain that the writer follows the main problematic tendency of his contemporary philosophers and <sup>of the</sup> Patriotic thought which had already developed its own form, particularly after the First Ecumenical Council.

ST. GREGORY begins the poem by a confession that God is one, while matter ("ύλη") and the created species form a multiplicity, and ontologically they have their existence in time, that is, they are not in any relation with the eternity of the Ultimate One. This latter idea was an achievement of Greek Philosophy. ST. GREGORY apparently fights against it.

"Εἷς θεός· ὕλη δ' αὖτε καὶ εἶδεα μῦθος ἀφανής,  
ἐχθρὸν πίτυναι νοούμενα ὡς συνἀναρχα" <sup>1</sup>

The essential aim of this statement, even before its full realization at the end, must be more than a mere conception; it must be the defence of the pure religious belief, rather than mere opposition to

the Greek philosophical explanation of the point at issue. Does it mean a deliberate refutation of the Neoplatonic tendencies, which might be characterized already as theurgical, in the sense that the later Neoplatonists compromise the purpose of classical philosophy with the practice of traditional sacrifices? It is very difficult to suggest a final answer to a problem which <sup>takes on the question concerning</sup> the temporal definition of the later period of the Platonic tradition.<sup>2</sup> Certainly ST. GREGORY puts philosophy and pagan religion on the same position; the risk from both is equal:

" τῶν μὲν ὅσα πλάσσουνσι θεοὺς μορφώματα σεπτά,  
οὐκ ἔσαν, ἀλλὰ γέγοντο, θεοῦ μεγάλου θέλοντος" <sup>3</sup>

On the other hand the explicit statement by ST. GREGORY that God is One and simultaneously Three Persons, singles out each of them in itself ("μοναδικόν")<sup>4</sup> and entails <sup>their</sup> absolute stability, viz. that God would still be Trinity even if Creation did not exist, since the manifestation of the Persons occurs in accordance with the nature. V. LOSSKY underscored the fact that even created intelligence cannot hold in itself the economic manifestation of the Persons, excluding thus any idea that the Holy Trinity depended upon a changeable reality.<sup>5</sup>

The point had been <sup>earlier</sup> discussed by ST. ATHANASIUS, who based it upon the general doctrine of the eternity of God and the consubstantiality of the Persons.<sup>6</sup> ST. GREGORY proceeds along the same path but more systematically and philosophically. V. LOSSKY notices that 'ST. GREGORY speaks to the philosophers as a philosopher, that he may win the philosopher to the contemplation of the Trinity'.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless

he preserves the Christian doctrine from a purely logical articulation which might be considered as another philosophical system side by side with the existing ones. His dogmatic expressions are of an antinomic character, especially <sup>those of</sup> the Trinitarian dogma. God is beyond the created categories, He is always "Μονὰς ἔν Τριᾷδι - Τριάς ἔν Μονάδι" (One in Three - Three in One). In the reality of God the dyad, viz. the origin of dialectical dualism, must be excluded.

We may bring forward two passages from ST. GREGORY'S poems as we intend to elucidate the above mentioned antinomic schema, as well as to examine it in harmony with the general theme of the simplicity and unity in the Godhead. The first passage is known from a previous citation, which runs thus:

"... ἡ Μονὰς τριάξουσ', ἡ Τριάς πάλιν  
ἐνίξεν ἀμφοῖν ἐνθέως νοουμένη" <sup>8</sup>

and the second one is quoted for the first time; this belongs to the very important poem De Spiritu Sancto and is as follows:

"Ἐν μονάδος Τριάς ἔστι, καὶ ἔν Τριάδος μονὰς ἀνὴρ" <sup>9</sup>

Beginning with these two passages and bearing in mind their antinomic content we have to ask, always drinking deeply of the waters of Patristic learning, how we can attain to the contemplation of the three-fold monad; at last how we can express the antinomy of unity and triplicity in terms of the Christian tradition in order to comprehend ST. GREGORY'S theology. V. LOSSKY talks about the application of apophatic theological method when we must become free from concepts

proper only to human thought,<sup>10</sup> such as, for example, reasoning.

The elucidation is due to ST. GREGORY himself; the mind must be in a continuous motion from One to Three, from Three to One.<sup>11</sup> God is beyond any kind of motion, beyond any measure. We are forced to admit the deficiency of our language to express the ineffable mystery of the Holy Trinity; not only the One, that is, the substance of God, is absolutely unknown but the revelation of the Persons remains economic, their interrelations are unknown to created beings, even to angels.<sup>12</sup> They have, as<sup>the</sup> purified Christians, the possibility to gain a knowledge of the glory of God and for this reason they may teach the men the lex orandi,<sup>13</sup> whereas purified Christians prepare Christians to accept the orthodox lex credendi.

When ST. GREGORY is forced by heretics to deal with an analysis of the relations of the Three Persons he is very cautious about making any exact classification among Them; he insists vigorously on attributing the absolute knowledge of the Holy Trinity to the Persons themselves,<sup>14</sup> and especially<sup>on</sup> the problem of using human language in order that the Trinitarian reality might be illustrated; he is more intricate on occasions<sup>especially</sup> when he uses terms borrowed from the Greek philosophical arsenal, as on the point at issue, the term "Μονάς".

On the assumption that the usage of the term "Μονάς" is applied firstly to the unity of God, it is necessary to explore its meaning in<sup>co-</sup>relation to that which ST. GREGORY has called Ἀποστολική descriptive noun for the singularity of the authority of God.

We have to turn again to the greatest of ST. GREGORY'S commentators viz. ST. MAXIMUS, who, on behalf of ST. GREGORY, offers a further elucidation of the properties of <sup>the</sup>Monad. The following extract belongs to the very important chapter with which we set out to explain the meaning of the ontological motion in created nature in a previous chapter.

"Μονὰς δὲ μόνῃ κυρίως διένητος, ὅτι μήτε ἀριθμὸς ἐστὶ, μήτε ἀριθμητὸν ἢ ἀριθμούμενον (οὔτε γὰρ μέρος ἢ ὅλον ἢ σχέσις ἐστὶν ἡ μονάς), καὶ κυρίως <sup>15</sup> ἀναρχος, ὅτι μηδέτερον ἑαυτῆς ἔχει πρεσβύτερον, ἐξ οὗ κινουμένη δέχεται τὸ εἶναι μονάς, καὶ ἀπειρον <sup>16</sup> κυρίως, ὅτι μηδὲν ἔχει συνυπάρχον ἢ συναριθμούμενον, καὶ ἀρχὴν κυρίως, ὅτι παντὸς καὶ ἀριθμοῦ καὶ ἀριθμούμενου καὶ ἀριθμητοῦ αἰτία τυγχάνει, ὥς πάσης σχέσεως καὶ παντὸς μέρους καὶ ὅλου ἐξηρημένη, καὶ κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς, πρῶτως τε καὶ μόνως καὶ ἀπλῶς, ἀλλ' οὐ, πρῶτη τε μονὰς διπάρχουσα καὶ μόνῃ". <sup>17</sup>

Here, for a time, we have the opportunity to underscore the common theological background of Greek patristic thought. ST. MAXIMUS repeats in a more analytic way than ST. GREGORY, a similar theological doctrine; he says that the Monad is "ἀκίνητος", "ἀναρχος", "ἀπειρος", "αἰτία" of all beings, as in ST. GREGORY'S passage Or 34.8 P.G. 36, 248Dsq. the Mastery (sc. God) is referred to as "ἡτοιχητικὴ", "ἀρχικὴ" "ἐκκίνητος". But the most crucial point of this comparison is the elucidation of the theme of the unity within the Godhead.

In classical philosophy PLATO and ARISTOTLE had suggested two solutions; PLATO and the Neoplatonists later applied the theory of the division according to which we have a concrete genus, viz. the substance which is divided into <sup>40</sup>parts, every one of which in turn holds the richness



of the whole.<sup>18</sup> The substance thus indicates a universal existence over, above and beyond individuals,<sup>19</sup> an "ὅλον πρὸ τῶν μερῶν".<sup>20</sup> In talking about the Godhead of the Three Trinitarian Hypostaseis as <sup>α</sup>genus, there is a danger that this application may be considered as implying four <sup>coexisting</sup> beings in a subordinational system. On the other hand the unity in species, which ARISTOTLE introduces, presupposes an abstract existence of a genus which is hypostasized only in its species.<sup>21</sup> Later <sup>on</sup> PROCLUS added a third type of unity, viz. the whole as implicit in the existence of each of its parts severally "ὁλότης ἐν τῷ μέρει".<sup>22</sup>

In ST. GREGORY the problem of wholeness as a triadic unity should be faced in accordance with the origin ("ἀρχή") and cause ("αἰτία") among the members of the Holy Trinity. ST. MAXIMUS in his analysis of ST. GREGORY'S statement that the Mastery "(καλεῖται δὲ ἡ μὲν θεός) ἔστι τῶν μὲν πάντων διαιρετῶν ἐνικωτέρα, τῶν δὲ τελείως μοναδικῶν ἀφθονωτέρα"<sup>23</sup> comes to conclude that the Monad is transcendent above and beyond the categories of either the whole as the sum of its parts, or the whole in an absolute sense, or rather the Monad is transcendent ("ἐξῆρημένη") above any notion of schesis, a thing that might have been compared with that which was called "ὁλότης ἐν τῷ μέρει" (PROCLUS)<sup>24</sup>

On the other hand we may speak of a triadic structure of the ultimate cause of the Neoplatonists which holds the position of the "ἀμέθεκτον καλόν",<sup>25</sup> while it inheres "καθ' ὑπαρξιν" in "τὰ μετεχόμενα καλὰ"; it is present furthermore "κατὰ μέθεξιν" in concrete things.<sup>26</sup> But in ST. MAXIMUS the transcendent Monad corresponds to ST. GREGORY'S statement that every "ἰδιότης"<sup>27</sup> viz.

Hypostasis of Godhead is incomprehensible and beyond the power of our intellect; we cannot either perceive or formulate dogmatic definitions ("δογματίζεισθαι") on such a subject, which is beyond our ken ("ὑπεράπρον").<sup>28</sup> This human deficiency is stated in stressing simultaneously the singularity ("μοναδικότης") not only of the Godhead, but of the divine Persons as well.<sup>29</sup> This point was of paramount importance and of a pivotal interest in the general efforts of the Cappadocian Fathers' thought, as it becomes intimate with the so called theme of the connumeration in the Holy Trinity.

Thus according to ST. GREGORY God is "εἷς", also the Father is "εἷς", the Son is "εἷς" and the Holy Spirit is "ἐν" as well, since the Godhead is "Τρισσὴ Μονάς".<sup>30</sup> This singularity of the Holy Trinity is characterized as "ἡ ἡμετέρα εὐσέβεια".<sup>31</sup> The characterization of each one of the Persons as "εἷς" is due to the discrimination, without separation, of the Hypostaseis, as ST. GREGORY says in another passage "τριῶν ἀπείρων ἀπείρον συμφυΐαν".<sup>32</sup> We should say that the singularity of each one of the Persons constitutes the basis in order that we might acknowledge the "μοναδικότης" of the Divine Nature, and therefore the limited character of our mind, logos and spirit. It seems that ST. GREGORY returns again to his beloved theme of the Holy Dispensation; we must presume the "μοναδικὸν" of the manifestation of God throughout the Mystery of the Holy Dispensation, "θεὸν τὰ τρία, μετ' ἀλλήλων νοούμενα τῷ ταυτῷ τῆς κινήσεως καὶ τῆς φύσεως",<sup>33</sup> where the "τῷ ταυτῷ τῆς κινήσεως" is referred to the manifestation of each of the Persons "μοναδικῶς", but "ἀδιαιρέτως" of the other Two, since the "ταυτὸν τῆς φύσεως"

states the singularity of the Godhead; otherwise we might not vindicate the phrase " τῷ ταυτῷ τῆς κινήσεως ", which is a further statement of the homocousion of the Persons throughout the Holy Economy. The " κίνησις " according to chapter IV has its origin in the Monad but remains with the Triad, viz. on the manifestation of the Persons.

In the consequent passage we must pay great attention to the usage of the adjective " μοναδικός " and its synonyms; it discusses the " μοναδικότης " of everything that we know about the Deity and it is against both Greek polytheism and Jewish monotheism.

Ἡ μήτε ἀγέννητον τὸν Υἱόν, εἰς γὰρ ὁ Πατήρ· μήτε Υἱόν τὸ Πνεῦμα, εἰς γὰρ ὁ Μονογενής· ἵνα καὶ τοῦτο θεῖκόν ἔχωσι τὸ μοναδικόν, ὃ μὲν τῆς υἰότητος, τὸ δὲ τῆς προόδου, καὶ οὐχ υἰότητος. Ἀληθῶς Πατέρα τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ πολλὴ γε τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀληθέστερον, ὅτι μόνως, ἰδιοτρόπως γὰρ, καὶ οὐχ ὡς τὰ σῶματα· καὶ μόνος, οὐ γὰρ μετὰ συζυγίας· καὶ μόνου, Μονογενοῦς γὰρ· καὶ μόνον, οὐ γὰρ υἱός πρότερον· καὶ ὅλον Πατήρ, καὶ ὅλου, τὸ γὰρ ἡμέτερον ἄδελον· καὶ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, οὐ γὰρ ὕστερον. Ἀληθῶς υἱόν τὸν υἱόν, ὅτι μόνος, καὶ μόνου, καὶ μόνως, καὶ μόνον· οὐ γὰρ καὶ Πατήρ, καὶ ὅλον υἱός, καὶ ὅλου, καὶ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, οὐποτε τοῦ εἶναι υἱός ἡρχμένος· οὐ γὰρ γε μεταμελείας ἢ θεότης, οὐδὲ γε προσωπῆς ἢ θέωσις, ἵνα λείπῃ ποτέ, τῷ μὲν τὸ εἶναι Πατέρα, τῷ δὲ τὸ εἶναι υἱόν. Ἀληθῶς ἅγιον τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· οὐ γὰρ καὶ ἄλλο τοιοῦτον, οὐδὲ οὕτως, οὐδὲ γε προσθήκης ὁ ἁγιασμός" 34

It is especially significant that ST. GREGORY offers a detailed explanation about the oneness of each of the divine Persons, as it has been mentioned previously, with reference to the " μοναδικόν " of their

Divinity. This brief sketch of the sense of "μοναδικότης" in the Trinitarian doctrine may be made somewhat clearer if we take into account the whole attempt in order that the existence of the creation may be disconnected from the coeternity with God.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore the particular usage of the adverbs "μόνως - ἰδιότροπῶς" is noteworthy because it refers to the manner of existence of the Son. Being the Father "ἀπ' ἀρχῆς" it means there was not a time when He was not as Father, an argument which ST. ATHANASIUS had used against ARIUS' doctrine about the Son, (viz. that He (sc. the Son) "ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν").<sup>36</sup> ST. GREGORY does not neglect to underline the divine character of all these expressions. In addition, the "μοναδικότης" of the Son and the Holy Spirit is based upon the "μοναδικότης" of the Father. So, as a prolongation of the emphatic phrase "οὐ μετὰ συζυγίας", by which any idea of a coexistence of God and creation is excluded, ST. GREGORY comes back looking into the whole subject in a conclusive way with a paradoxical schema. The following passage helps us to throw light on this more extensively: "Νῦν δὲ δίδασιε τοσοῦτον εἶδέναι μόνον, μονάδα ἔν Τριάδι, καὶ Τριάδα ἔν μονάδι προσκυνουμένην, παράδοξον ἔχουσαν καὶ τὴν διαίρεσιν καὶ τὴν ἔνωσιν. Μὴ φοβηθῆς τὰ πάθη, γέννησιν ὁμολογῶν. Ἀπαθές γὰρ τὸ θεῖον, καὶ εἰ γεγέννημεν. Ἐγὼ σοι τούτου ἑγγνητῆς, <sup>37</sup> ὅτι θεϊκῶς ἀλλοῦκ ἀνθρωπικῶς. Οὐδὲ γὰρ τὸ εἶναι αὐτῷ ἀνθρώπινον. φοβήσῃτι δὲ χρόνον καὶ κτίσιν. Οὐ γὰρ θεός, εἰ γέγονε, μὴ θεῶ συνηγορῶν διακενῆς, θεὸν ἀνέλης, ὁμόδουλον ποιῶν τὸ ὁμόθεον, ὃ καὶ σὲ τῆς δουλείας ἑλευθεροῦ, ἂν χρησίως ὁμολογῆς δεσποτεῖαν."<sup>38</sup>

At last the knowledge of <sup>the</sup> "μοναδικότης" of God becomes a subject of orthodox worship and confession as its reality surpasses any intellectual

achievement; " otherwise, ST. GREGORY stresses again, " God might be subject to time and creation; a statement which posits again the aforementioned theme of the " δουλεία " (service, sc. creation) and " δεσποτεία " (Mastery, sc. God). This is a consistent argument against those opposed to the homousion, and the whole thought goes back to the Arian controversy.

ST. ATHANASIUS in his effort to distinguish the 'φύσις' of God from that of men, asserts that God is simple in His nature, while man's nature is compound " δι' ἧν αἰτίαν καὶ πολλῶν κατὰ καιρὸν τέκνων γίνονται πατέρες οἱ ἄνθρωποι ".<sup>39</sup> Being God " ἀπλοῦς τὴν φύσιν " it means that the Father is the Father of One Son in order to remain " ἀμερής ".<sup>40</sup> Hence the Son is Monogenes.<sup>41</sup> It is obvious that ST. ATHANASIUS' starting point is the simplicity of the divine nature, a thing that everyone should accept and of course ARIUS; it was the common achievement of Greek thought at that time. Therefore ST. ATHANASIUS formulated the homousion of the Son. On the other hand ST. GREGORY stresses the " μοναδικότης " of the Father and His monarchy in order to avoid the accusation of tritheia, or of the introduction of two causes into the Holy Trinity. The homousion of the Holy Spirit is a consequence of this.

After ST. GREGORY this point was of a pivotal importance for the Greek Fathers who had as starting point the Person of the Father.<sup>42</sup> On the emergence of the monarchy of the Father the double question firstly whether the Persons are united by the " λόγος τῆς οὐσίας " or whether they are discerned as Hypostaseis, is abolished. How important this point

is appears from the cause of which gave rise to the Arian controversy.

According to the historian SOCRATES<sup>43</sup> the analysis of which part of the form " Τριάς ἐν Μοναδὶ - Μονὰς ἐν Τριάδι " has the priority over the other led to extremes. The chain of the events was as follows. ALEXANDER the bishop of Alexandria seems to have been accustomed to discuss dogmatic points with his clergymen. In such a meeting ALEXANDER had delivered a discourse on the Holy Trinity to face the one-sided tendency which presupposed the discrimination of the Hypostaseis in order to come back from the triplicity to the unity. His essential purpose was to point out the formulation "Τριάς ἐν Μοναδὶ " and vice versa. ARIUS' reaction was direct as he believed that his bishop's doctrine was identical with that of SABELLIUS.<sup>44</sup>

Taking for granted the contrast which exists between the extremes of the Trinitarian formulation it is noteworthy that ST. GREGORY claims that the true way lies always between two extremes.<sup>45</sup> As E. A. CLARK pointed out the doctrine of Via Media comes from ARISTOTLE'S philosophy from whom it was borrowed by later thinkers such as ARIUS, DIDYMUS, ALBINUS, CICERO, PLUTARCH and PHILO in his theory about the metriopatheia.<sup>46</sup> In CLEMENT the theory of Via Media occurs in order that the heresies may be exposed.<sup>47</sup> According to ST. GREGORY the Via Media is not a composition of two extremes, but it is an independent reality; for this reason he tries to define only the extremes. Furthermore he characterizes the Via Media as a Royal<sup>48</sup> term which will<sup>be</sup> passed throughout Patristic thought.<sup>49</sup>



It must be noted that ST. GREGORY talks about the Via Media of his life, which lies between hermits and cenobites, the Via Media between Knowledge and Revelation, the Via Media in social and pastoral work, as he believes in the unity of Economy and Theology in soteriological terms.<sup>50</sup>

In the sixth paragraph of Or 20, De Dogmate et Constitutione Episcoporum, ST. GREGORY talks explicitly about the meaning of the middle way of the dogmatic formulation and he identifies it with nothing less than the orthodox belief.<sup>51</sup> Furthermore he defines two extremes which in some way were the cause of his attempt to formulate the orthodox dogma. On this point at issue we may add that even when he uses philosophical schemes and elements detached from the Greek tradition nevertheless his ultimate goal remains within strictly ecclesiastical framework; thus, the starting point for the expression "Μόνας ἑν Τριάδι" and vice versa was Sabellianism and Arianism as well as that which has been introduced by their successors in ST. GREGORY'S time, especially by the Pneumatomachian sects. Of course the truth lies between them; the task of Christians consists of the escape from both, that is, the contraction of the Hypostaseis ("συναίρεσις") and the division of each from the other ("διαίρεσις", "τομή").<sup>52</sup> From a variety of passages of the Gregorian Corpus it is clear that the contraction of the Hypostaseis represents Sabellianism, while the division of them is referred to Arianism. The analysis of this particular view needs a further representation, in order that the divergences from orthodoxy might be defined.<sup>53</sup>



Although we can find a series of passages where Sabellianism is considered as opposite to Arianism, there are two passages, of which the first is the above mentioned sixth paragraph of Or 20, where it seems that these two heresies are put on the opposite side of a kind of polytheism of ultra-orthodox Christians " τῶν ἄγαν παρ' ἡμῖν ὀρθοδόξων ".<sup>54</sup> These two passages are almost of the same context as it will be clear from their quotation and their analysis as well.

Passage I Or.2.37 P.G. 35, 444C-445AB " Τριῶν γὰρ ὄντων τῶν νῦν περὶ τὴν θεολογίαν ἀρρῶσθημάτων; ἀθείας, καὶ ἰουδαϊσμοῦ, καὶ πολυθείας, ὧν τῆς μὲν Σαβέχιος προστάτης ὁ λίβυς ἐγένετο, τῆς δὲ Ἀρείου ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς, τῆς δὲ τινες τῶν ἄγαν παρ' ἡμῖν ὀρθοδόξων. Τίς ὁ ἐμὸς λόγος; τῶν τριῶν ὅσον ἐστὶ ἐλαβερόν διαφυγόντας, ἐν ὅροις μένειν τῆς εὐσεβείας, καὶ μήτε πρὸς τὴν Σαβελλίου ἀθείαν ἐκ τῆς καινῆς ταύτης ἀναλύσεως ἢ συνθέσεως ὑπαχθῆναι, μὴ μᾶλλον ἐν τὰ πάντα ἢ μηδὲν ἕκαστον εἶναι ὀριζομένους· φεύγει γὰρ εἶναι ὅπερ ἐστὶν εἰς ἀλλήλα μεταχωροῦντα καὶ μεταβαίνοντα· ἢ σύνθετόν τινα καὶ ἄτοπον ἡμῖν θεόν, ὥσπερ τὰ μυθώδη τῶν ζώων σκιαγραφοῦντας καὶ ἀνασχεττοντας· μήτε τὰς φύσεις τέμνοντας κατὰ τὴν Ἀρείου καλῶς ὀνομασθεῖσαν μανίαν, εἰς ἰουδαϊκὴν πενίαν κατακλεισθῆναι, καὶ φθόνον ἐπεισάγειν τῇ θεῇ φύσει, μόνῳ τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ τὴν θεότητα περιγράφοντες, ὥσπερ δεδοικότας μὴ διαφθείροιτο ἡμῖν ὁ θεός, θεοῦ Πατὴρ ὧν ἀληθινοῦ καὶ ὁμοτίμου τὴν φύσιν· μήτε τρεῖς ἀρχαὶς ἀλλήλαις ἀντεπεζάχοντας ἢ συντάσσοντας πολυαρχίαν εἰσάγειν Ἑλληνικὴν, ἣν πεφεύγαμεν! "

Passage II Or. 20.6 P.G. 35, 1072BC

"Μεσόττητα δὲ ὅταν εἴπω, τὴν ἀληθῆσαν λέγω, πρὸς ἣν ἐχέπειν καλῶς ἔχομεν μόνην· καὶ τὴν φαύλην συναίρεσιν παραιτούμενοι, καὶ τὴν αἰσχωτέραν διαίρεσιν· ὥς μήτε εἰς μίαν ὑπόστασιν συναίρεθέντα τὸν λόγον, δέει ποσυχθείας, φιλά ἡμῖν καταλιπεῖν τὰ ὀνόματα, τὸν αὐτὸν Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱόν, καὶ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ὑπολαμβάνουσι, καὶ μὴ μᾶλλον ἐν ταῖς πάντα ἢ μηδὲν ἑκαστὸν εἶναι ὀριζομένοις (φεύγοι γὰρ ἂν εἶναι ἅπερ ἔστιν, εἰς ἄλλα μεταχωροῦντα καὶ μεταβαλίνοντα)· μήτε εἰς τρεῖς ἢ ἑνάς καὶ ἀνομοίους οὐσίας καὶ ἀπερρήγημένους διαιρεθέντα, κατὰ τὴν Ἀρείου καχῶς ὀνομασθεῖσαν μανίαν, ἢ ἀνάρχους καὶ ἀτάκτους, καὶ ὅσον εἶπεν, ἀντιθέους· τῷ μὲν εἰς ἰουδαϊκὴν σμικρολογίαν κατακλεισθῆναι, μόνῳ τῷ ἀγεννίτῳ τὴν θεότητα περιγράφοντας· τῷ δὲ εἰς ἑναντίον μὲν, κακὸν δὲ ἴσον πεσεῖν, τρεῖς ἀρχὰς ὑποτιθεμένους, καὶ τρεῖς θεούς, ὅ τῶν προειρημένων αἰσχωτέρον".

From these two very important passages we may stress the following points: (a) The heretical infirmities in ST. GREGORY'S days were three. (b) SABELLIUS' heresy is characterized as atheism. (c) ARIUS' heresy is reckoned equal with the madness of Judaism. (d) The fanaticism of some ultra-orthodox Christians leads to polytheism. To be more specific, Sabellianism is here identical with atheism as by its analysis the Divine Hypostaseis end in nothing, for they are transferred and pass into each other in such a way as to cease to be that which each one of them is; thus the Father becomes the Son and He is modified in the Holy Spirit. The reason for this atheistic monism, according to ST. GREGORY'S explanation, was a fear of a kind of polytheism, which

SABELLIUS thought that lay in wait, if he recognized the simultaneous acceptance of the divine essence and the Three Persons. His doctrine seems to be very close to the mystical pantheism of the ancient mysteries and the Orphic Poetry.<sup>55</sup> On the other hand ARIUS appears to be a strict monotheist, having as his starting point that God is only the Father and everything else is of another essence different from that of the Father. As G. FLOROVSKY<sup>56</sup> pointed out, ARIUS failed to distinguish between birth and creation, so for him the term origin, which has two meanings, has been used to characterize birth (the mode of existence of the Son) with creation which has a moment in time. T. E. POLLARD<sup>57</sup> maintains that the Arian heresy was of a philosophical monotheism rather than a biblical one, stressing particularly the emphatic usage of the adjective "ἀγέννητος",<sup>58</sup> which ARIUS attributed to God in abstract terms, as in the common philosophical stock. We should say that he judaized appropos to 'selective literalism' in order to find biblical assertions about the one-ness of God, but he introduced a kind of polytheism in the content of faith, by alleging a plurality of severed natures. ("μήτε τὰς φύσεις τέμνοντας" Pass. I, "μήτε εἰς τρεῖς ἢ ζένας καὶ ἀνομίους οὐσίας καὶ ἀπερρήγημένας διασπρεθέντα" Pass. II). In addition to these two heresies ST. GREGORY refers to that of ultra-orthodox people who introduced three principles in their attempt to defend the divinity of the Son and especially of the Holy Spirit; ST. GREGORY discerns a kind of polytheism after the Greek fashion, although it seems that he does not worry particularly about the activity of this part. It is rather certain that ST. GREGORY feels he must distinguish this Ultra-Orthodox party in order to defend himself against the

charge of Tritheism. He mentions clearly that he has been accused of tritheia by those who go to all lengths in ungodliness and who are moderate in a sense with regard to the Son.<sup>59</sup> Their theological argumentation turned against the divinity of the Holy Spirit and in actuality against the plurality of principles ("πολυαρχία"), as they misunderstood ST. GREGORY'S defence of the divinity of the Holy Spirit put him side by side with those who ST. GREGORY characterizes as ultra-orthodox. ST. GREGORY stresses simultaneously the divinity of each Person and the unity of their essence. "ὥς ὅτι ἂν τῶν τριῶν καθέλης, τὸ πᾶν ἔσθι καθήρηκώς, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦ παντός ἐκπεπτωκώς. Βέλτιον μικρὰν τῆς ἐνώσεως φαντασίαν λαβὴν, ἢ παντελῆ τολμῆσαι δυσσεβειαν."<sup>60</sup>

ST. GREGORY seems to discuss the theme of heretical sects with conscious knowledge of the Greek religious and philosophical tradition; so in another passage from the fifth Theolog. Oratio he brings back Greek monotheism in a more explicit way.<sup>61</sup> He says that there is but one God, because there is only one thing that can be called Godhead, therefore though there are Three Persons, there is but one source from which all that belongs to the Godhead issues and as this is necessarily unique, we cannot conceive in it personages independent of each other.<sup>62</sup>

On the other hand ST. GREGORY is categorical; Greeks also believe in one Godhead, as their more advanced philosophers declare, and furthermore with us humanity is one, but they have many gods, not one, just as there are many men. The reason for this multiplicity which leads to the plurality of Principles, is explained by the fact that in this case

common nature has a unity which is conceivable only in thought

("ἐπινοία θεωρητικόν ").<sup>63</sup> ELIAS CRET. distinguishes the

Divine Hypostaseis from that of men's, as well as the Unity of Godhead

and ours, as based upon this recognition: "Ἄτερόν ἐστι τῷ

πράγματι θεωρεῖσθαι, καὶ ἄλλο τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τῇ ἐπινοίᾳ. Ἐπὶ

μὲν οὖν πάντων τῶν ὑποστάσεων διαίρεσις πράγματι

θεωρεῖται, ἡ δὲ κοινότης καὶ ἡ συνάρησις καὶ τὸ ἐν λόγῳ καὶ ἐπινοίᾳ ".<sup>64</sup>

The same point occurs in ST. GREGORY PAL. who explains that SABELLIUS'

view introduces a multiplicity of hypostaseis by the type of one

"μεθεκτὴ οὐσία ", which SABELLIUS seemed to apply to the substance

of God. ST. GREGORY PAL. discusses about the 'unions' and 'distinc-

tions' in God having as starting point the well known principle: "Ἡ οὐ-

σία παρ' ὧν ἐστὶ μετεχόμενη, τοσαύτας καὶ τὰς ὑποστάσεις ἔχει ".<sup>65</sup>

Thus the unity in Godhead according to SABELLIUS corresponds to the

Proclian one of the whole-in-the part, a thing that is based upon the

"μεθεκτὴ " substance which may hypostasize every one that partici-

pates in it, and for this reason the Divine Persons are "εἰς ἄλληλα

μεταχωροῦντα καὶ μεταβαίνοντα ",<sup>66</sup> viz. ST. GREGORY PAL.

discern in SABELLIUS' doctrine the coexistence of pantheism and poly-

theism, in other words the coexistence of the plurality of principles

and a perfect atheism. Of course he argues against his contemporary

heretics as survivals of the ancient heresies. "Τὸ δ' ἐστὶ χεῖρον ἁ-

μα καὶ παραδοξότερον, ὅτι μυριοὑπόστατον ἐντεῦθεν ποιοῦντες οἱ ἀντι-

λέγοντες ἡμῖν τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, τὰς τρεῖς θέας ὑποστάσεις εἰς

μίαν συναλείφουσι κατὰ Λαβέλλιον. Ἐν ἐνὶ γὰρ ἑκδοτῶ τῶν

μετεχόντων τὰς τρεῖς εἰς μίαν συνάγουσιν ὑπόστασιν, ὥς ἑκα-

στον τῶν τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ θεοῦ μεθεκτὴν δογματιζόντων μυριά-

κίς ἄλλον Λαβέλλιον διατελεῖν ".<sup>67</sup>

Furthermore ST. GREGORY insists on the identity of substance of the Persons, "τῆς οὐσίας ταυτότητα",<sup>68</sup> although each of them is an unchangeable personality, inasmuch as "ἡ γὰρ ἰδιότης ἀκίνητος",<sup>69</sup> otherwise ST. GREGORY in a rhetorical way asks himself how the "ἰδιότης" could remain, if it were changeable, and could be removed from one to another.<sup>70</sup> For this reason he tries to define properly, so far as it is possible,<sup>71</sup> the particular mode of the subsistence of each Person as well as their Unity "Κοινὸν γὰρ Πατρὶ μὲν καὶ Υἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, τὸ μὴ γεγονέναι, καὶ ἡ θεότης. Υἱὸς δὲ καὶ ἁγίος Πνεύματι, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς. Ἰδιὸν δὲ Πατρὶ μὲν, ἡ ἀγεννησία. Υἱοῦ δὲ, ἡ γέννησις. Πνεύματος δὲ, ἡ ἐκτεμψις".<sup>72</sup>

On this assumption we might speak of a group of common and proper definitions of the revelation of the Holy Trinity : Firstly the common cause ("ἀιτία") of the Son and the Holy Spirit may be noticed; namely the Father ("εἰς ἐν αἴτιον καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος ἀναφερομένων");<sup>73</sup> secondly we have to stress the existence of one common power and will,<sup>74</sup> and thirdly we must underline the existence of one Godhead in contrast with the multiplicity of gods in the pagan world.<sup>75</sup> This last acknowledgement eventually leads ST. GREGORY above all to expound the well known Trinitarian formulation of "Τρισὴν Μοῶς", applying it to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

In turn, a particular attention must be given to two passages of the Or 23, De pace III, from which the concreteness of the articulation of the Trinitarian dogma may be abstracted in terms of the ecclesiastical tradition. In the first one he uses abstract language similar to



the Greek philosophical fashion in order to elucidate the mathematical conception embedded in the term "τριάς" itself; He says that the Holy Trinity must not be considered as an enumeration of unequal things ("ἀνίστα"), inasmuch as it would be better to have ten members in the Godhead or a hundred or at least a myriad in order that innumerable things might be enumerated and not only three. At this point lies the peril of the Greek polytheism of pagan religion and Neoplatonism. But the reality of the Holy Trinity is found beyond it, since the conception ("σύλληψις") of the Three Hypostaseis is such that exists among equal and equally honourable members. ST. GREGORY advances forward<sup>by</sup> analyzing the meaning of the "σύλληψις ἰσῶν καὶ ὁμοτιμῶν".<sup>76</sup>

As P. EVDOKIMOV noticed, the trinitarian terminology passed through detailed examinations before its preciseness was affirmed, and, therefore, at the beginning a confusion was inevitable. Having been helped by ARISTOTLE, who says that, (a) the things which have the same substance are identical, (b) those which are of the same quality are similar, and (c) the things which are of the same quantity are equal, we can say that the Holy Trinity is the Singular God according to identity and substance and that the absolutely equal Hypostaseis possess the only one and same nature.<sup>77</sup> In addition ST. GREGORY, as ST. BASIL also, uses the term "ὁμοτιμος" (equal in honour) in the sense of the homousion.<sup>78</sup>

In turn ST. GREGORY uses more concrete wording which he attributes to the knowledge of purified Christians, who, however, cannot explain



the relation and the order among the Hypostaseis; the "Τριάς" remains a mystery even after the manifestation of the Persons.<sup>79</sup> It seems rather clear that ST. GREGORY prefers to begin with the manifestation of the Person within the Holy Economy rather than to apply an abstract terminology on the biblical belief; thus the Appellations by which the Christians are reborn remain the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit as well as the confession of their homousion or "λόγος τῆς θεότητος".<sup>80</sup> Following ST. ATHANASIUS, as J. A. DORNER<sup>81</sup> pointed out, who although he wrote a particular treatise about the Incarnation, never tried to investigate the relation of the Logos to the Father, ST. GREGORY is equally reluctant to explain the mode of the procession of the Holy Spirit, or the <sup>inter-</sup>relationship of the Persons. On the other hand it is important to stress the fact that in later Neoplatonism we may find similar wording, when the philosopher articulates the order of the trinitarian hypostaseis, with a religious appeal to Orphic Poetry. PROCLUS is a characteristic example of this notorious Neoplatonic mysticism. The following passages which come from him of a texture very similar to that of ST. GREGORY.

Passage I In PLAT. Tim. V. 291C "Διότι καὶ πρὸ τοῦ κόσμου τῶν νοερῶν ἡγούνται (sc. Νύξ and φάνης) θεῶν ἐν τῷ ἀδύτῳ διαιωνίως ἱδρυμένοι, καθά φησιν Ὀρφεύς, τὴν κρύφιον αὐτῶν τάξιν καὶ ἀνέκφαντον ἑκείνος ἀδύτον ἀποκαλῶν".

Passage II In PLAT. Parm. I. IV. p. 235 "Ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων τῶν νοητῶν εἰδῶν ἀληθεῖς καὶ τὸ μὴ πρὸς ἡμᾶς αὐτὰ τὴν δύναμιν ἔχειν μηδὲ ἡμᾶς πρὸς ἑκείνα· καὶ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἀγνωστὰ ἔστι καὶ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἡμε-

τεραν ἰδρύται νόποι, ἐν τῷ ἀδύτῳ κεκρυμμένα τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ ὁ εἶποι  
 ὁ θεολόγος, μόνη γνώριμα τῇ προσεχῶς μετὰ ταῦτα τάζει τῶν θεῶν"  
 (id est Nocti).<sup>82</sup>

It is obvious that the phraseology is similar, but ST. GREGORY escapes from the peril of succumbing to an abstract mysticism, as he always turns to the biblical belief, and, furthermore, introduces the so called paradoxical schemes into the formulation of the Trinitarian dogma: "Ἐν γὰρ ἑν τρισὶ ἢ θεότης, καὶ τὰ τρία ἓν τὰ ἐν οἷς ἢ θεότης, ἢ, τό γε ἀκριβέστερον εἰπεῖν, ἢ ἢ θεότης".<sup>83</sup> Thus at the very beginning of the paragraph which follows this passage ST. GREGORY borrows ST. PAUL'S<sup>84</sup> witness for his interpretation, and he takes the opportunity to stress the economic manifestation of the Persons. "Ἡ μὲν δέ, εἰς θεὸς ὁ Πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ εἰς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν Πνεῦμα ἁγίον, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα. τοῦ ἐξ οὗ, καὶ δι' οὗ, καὶ ἐν ᾧ, μὴ φύσεις τεμνόντων (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν μετέπιπτον αἰ προθέσεις, ἢ αἰ τάζεις τῶν ὀνομάτων) ἀλλὰ χαρακτηριζόντων μίας καὶ ἀσυχνίου φύσεως ἰδιότητος"<sup>85</sup>

In this passage the three prepositions "of", "by", "in" are put side by side with the order of the three Names and they do not discriminate the divine nature, but characterize the "ἰδιότητος", viz. the specific mode of the Hypostaseis of a nature which is one and unconfused. It might be said with justification that the parenthetical explanation "οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν μετέπιπτον αἰ προθέσεις ἢ αἰ τάζεις τῶν ὀνομάτων" is parallel to the afore-mentioned passage Or 20.6 P.G. 35, 1072B in which ST. GREGORY defends the orthodox belief against Sabellianism.

Their opposition particularly lies: (a) in the explicit statement that among the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit there is not any kind of alternation " εἰς ἀλλήλα μεταχωρῶντα καὶ μεταβαίνοντα ",<sup>86</sup> (b) in the alternation of the three prepositional phrases " ἐξ οὗ ", " δι' οὗ ", " ἐν ᾧ ", among the three Persons, although in the same context ST. GREGORY says that these prepositions characterize the " ἰδιότητες " (sc. the Hypostaseis) of a nature which is one and unconfused. Thus at first sight he seems to admit a kind of alternation within the Holy Trinity, but full light will be thrown on the point at issue<sup>which</sup> will clear up every suspicion of Sabellianism.

In our task we will elucidate first of all the parenthetical phrase " οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν μετέπιπτον ἀπὸ προθέσεως ἢ ἀπὸ τάξεως τῶν ὀνομάτων " which consists of two subjects of search. As regards the use of the above mentioned prepositions in the formulation of the Trinitarian dogma, ST. GREGORY surely refers to ST. BASIL'S treatise De Spiritu Sancto, and especially to the chapters II-VIII. In these ST. BASIL refutes the Arians and Pneumatomachian sects who attributed exclusively the preposition " ἐξ οὗ " to the Father, the " δι' οὗ " to the Son, and the " ἐν ᾧ " to the Holy Spirit, in order that from the different functions of the Persons in the Holy Economy<sup>they</sup> might infer different natures. Thus the heretics " τὸ μὲν γὰρ, ἐξ οὗ, τὸν θεμιουργόν σημαίνειν βούλονται· τὸ δέ, δι' οὗ, τὸν δημιουργόν, ἢ τὸ ὄργανον· τὸ δέ, ἐν ᾧ, τὸν χρόνον δηλοῦν ἢ τὸν τόπον ".<sup>87</sup>

As ELIAS CRET.<sup>88</sup> the Commentator pointed out, the theory about this usage of the prepositions comes from PLATO and ARISTOTLE and with many

variations through Neoplatonism and PHILO<sup>89</sup> it passed to the heretics of the first centuries.

When ST. GREGORY delivered the Or. in Sancta Lumina on 6th January 380,<sup>90</sup> he knew well ST. BASIL'S dissertation De Spiritu Sancto, as it is dated in 375.<sup>91</sup> Thus he reproduces here his friend's conclusions without paying attention to the extensive development of the already well known orthodox doctrine, according to which the alternation of the above mentioned prepositions among the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, states only their common nature and preserves simultaneously the "ἰδιότης" of each of them unchangeable. In addition we must underline the fact that ST. GREGORY does not replace the "ἰδιότης" (sc. Hypostaseis) with the prepositions "ἐξ οὗ", "δι' οὗ", "ἐν ᾧ", but he uses them in order to characterize the "ἰδιότητες" themselves. On this assumption it is important to observe the use of the noun "φύσις" (a) as an object of the participle "τεμνόντων", and (b) as possessive genitive of the noun "ἰδιότητες", "μή φύσεις τεμνόντων (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν μετέπιπτον αἱ προθέσεις, ἢ αἱ τάξεις τῶν ὀνομάτων), ἀλλὰ χαρακτηζόντων μίας καὶ αὐτοῦ φύσεως ἰδιότης";<sup>92</sup> viz. only in the second case is referred to <sup>it</sup>divine nature, since the prepositions characterize the "ἰδιότητες" of <sup>the</sup> Godhead within the Mystery of the Holy Economy, as ST. BASIL points out in chapter XVI of the aforesaid treatise, under the indicative title: "ὅτι ἀχώριστον ἐπὶ πάσης ἐννοίας, πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, περὶ τε τῆς τῶν νοητῶν δημιουργίας, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἰκονομίας, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς προσδοκωμένης κρίσεως".<sup>93</sup>

Let us now see the above mentioned second part, viz. the phrase "οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν μετέπιπτον... αἱ τάξεις τῶν ὀνομάτων" which introduces

the alternation into the order of the names of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The point at issue has been discussed from another angle in chapter II, where we have studied the significance of the divine appellations as well as their interchange among the Persons of the Holy Trinity, while here it will be examined closely and with reference to the possibility of a connumeration of the three Hypostaseis, in order that the 'Τριάς' might be complete.

To begin with ST. GREGORY'S concrete analysis, a number as that of 'Τριάς' states only how many things are included under it, and tells nothing about their nature.<sup>94</sup> Again this principle is derived from ST. BASIL; he uses it to prove the unalterability of a definite<sup>95</sup> nature, even when it is possible for it to be enumerated and also to underline the importance of the divine Names themselves as being beyond any kind of number.<sup>96</sup> On the other hand ST. GREGORY is more sophisticated in the refutation of heretical views. Thus he inaugurates his discussion with the Arians on the ground that they have overthrown the union "ἐνωσις"<sup>97</sup> in the Godhead. What the meaning of this descriptive word is, surely not as an abstract term, is to be found in another passage of his Orat. 42, known as Supremum Vale, which stands for the place of his confession of faith vis-a-vis the Fathers of the Second Ecumenical Council.<sup>98</sup>

Having already analysed the particular point, viz. that the Τριάς is that who is "ἀναρχον καὶ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ μετὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς"<sup>99</sup> (who is without beginning, the beginning and who is with the beginning), and that the names of them are "Πατήρ, Υἱὸς καὶ ἁγίον Πνεῦμα",

ST. GREGORY confesses that they have one only nature and identifies the nature with God, " φύσις δὲ τοῖς τρισὶ μία, θεός ".<sup>100</sup> Furthermore the Oneness and the same Godhead of them is inferred from their homousion, which at any rate presupposes a common point of reference; ST. GREGORY claims the hypostasis of <sup>the</sup> Father as the basis of their unity ( ἐνὼσις δὲ ὁ Πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ, καὶ πρὸς ὃν ἀνάγεται τὰ ἑξῆς <sup>101</sup>), from whom the Two others are derived and on whom they depend. This dependence does not annihilate the distinction of the derived Hypostaseis; it is necessary for the sake of harmony, 'following the First' on the part of the last Two, as the Three are inseparable in essence, will and power. " Ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐν ἑκάστων αὐτῶν ἔχει πρὸς τὸ συγκεείμενον, οὐχ ἥττον ἢ πρὸς ἑαυτό, τῷ ταυτῷ τῆς οὐσίας καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως. Καὶ οὗτος ὁ τῆς ἐνώσεως λόγος, ὅσον ἑρ' οἷς ἡμεῖς κατελήγαμεν ".<sup>102</sup> The slight opposition, which seems to exist between the above mentioned passages, viz. Or 42.15 P.G. 36, 476B and Or 31.16 P.G. 36, 152B, is justified from their general context and from the syntactic form of the word " ἐνὼσις " in both cases.<sup>103</sup>

In parag. 16 of the Or. 31 ST. GREGORY, having refuted the meaning of the unity of <sup>the</sup> gods in Greek religion, defends the divinity of each Hypostasis <sup>of the Trinity</sup> on the ground of the identity of essence and power, and before advancing to explain the meaning of the connumeration <sup>of the Hypostaseis</sup> in parag. 18 of the same Or., refutes the accusation that his belief was tritheia. Firstly he had to overthrow the following syllogism that, according to his witness, his assumed disputer in parag. 17 had advanced:



A. Πάντα τὸ ὁμοούσια συναριθμεῖται ἐνὶ ἀριθμῷ

B. Ὁ Πατήρ, ὁ Υἱὸς καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα εἰσι ὁμοούσια

C. Ὁ Πατήρ, ὁ Υἱὸς καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα συναριθμοῦνται ἐνὶ ἀριθμῷ <sup>104</sup>

This should mean that the three Hypostaseis are three gods, since for the Arian disputant only things of the same nature come under a number which sums them up. On this assumption, if the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit can be called three at all, it can only be as three gods, on the grounds that it is impossible for heterogeneous things to be under the same number: "Ὁὐ συναριθμεῖται τὰ μὴ ὁμοούσια."; they are reckoned one by one, e.g. a lion, and a goat, and a cock, because they have "μοναδικήν τὴν δῆλωσιν". <sup>105</sup>

On this point at issue ST. GREGORY borrows from ST. BASIL the argument that every number expresses the quantity of what is included under it, and not the nature of the things. In turn ST. GREGORY disproves his opponent's theory, especially his interpretation of the noun "συναρίθμησις", viz. the contraction of the things under the same number. His arguments, against <sup>the</sup> Arians, might have been summarized as follows: (a) In the Bible things of various natures are counted up under a common number. <sup>106</sup> (b) Things so closely connected and of one nature can be designated singly, <sup>107</sup> whereas (c) Things, which are very different from each other, are reckoned under one number as well. <sup>108</sup>

His opponent elucidates more his premise, viz. that 'Things of one essence are designated together' <sup>by</sup> explaining in paragr. 19 how a connumeration must be considered: "Ἀλλ' ἐμοί, φησὶν (sc. the objector), ἑκείνα συναριθμοῦμενα λέγεται, καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας, οἷς συνεκφωνεῖται καταλλήλως καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα". <sup>109</sup>



to whose statement ST. GREGORY has to answer two points further:

(a) Things can be connumerated if they are of the same nature and their names also pronounced together with it, like 'three men', 'three gods', (b) that it is a mistaken principle that heterogeneous things, under a neuter numeral, might be connumerated, as "τρία τὰδε, καὶ τὰδε".<sup>110</sup> ST. GREGORY'S reply consisted of a methodological

refutation and further of a pure repayment "ἀντίδοσις", thus:

(a) <sup>The</sup>opponent's view is a legislation for language, not a task of a person who thinks and speaks truly,<sup>111</sup> and (b) in accordance with the assertion about the kind of connumeration it must be <sup>possible to</sup> reserve for the specific "εἰδικώτερα" names, what is reserved for <sup>the</sup>generic (γενικώτερα) names, i.e. connumeration." <sup>40</sup> γὰρ οὐ τετήρηκας ἐπὶ τῶν γενικωτέρων ὀνομάτων, τούτο καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπαιτήσομεν ἐπὶ τῶν εἰδικωτέρων, κατὰ τὴν σὴν ἀνάσχεσιν".<sup>112</sup> This means that in the case of Peter, Paul and John they would have come under the same number, if we could have said three Peters, three Pauls, three Johns!

The starting point for the following argumentation belongs to ST. BASIL, with whose analysis in chap. 17 of De Spir. Sanct. we might elucidate the meaning of the comparative forms "εἰδικώτερος" and "γενικώτερος". ST. GREGORY uses the terms "γενικός" and "εἰδικός" with two meanings; the first can be translated by the word 'generic', which MASON adopts, but also by the word 'common' as <sup>LNPNE</sup> translate it, and the second, bears the meaning of the adjective 'specific' in accordance with MASON and 'proper' <sup>with the</sup> <sup>LNPNE</sup>.<sup>113</sup> ST. BASIL also had classified the names in two parallel categories, viz. the common names ("κοινὰ τῶν σημασιῶν") and the proper ones, which have a particular power

on the names derived from them. He brings as <sup>an</sup> example the term 'οὐσία' as common name of such beings as : animal - people - man - Peter or Paul or John - exemplifying thus the term " οὐσία ", because each of them is " ἰδικώτερον " of that which lies on the higher state.

According to ST. BASIL the Pneumatomachians, as the Arians before them, applied the classification of the common and specific category to the Persons of the Holy Trinity: " Ἄρα οὖν τοῦτο νοοῦσι τὴν ὑπαρίσθησιν, τὴν τοῦ κοινού εἰς τὰ ὑπεσταχμένα διαίρεσιν ".<sup>114</sup> This point leads precisely to the Neoplatonic theory of the subordination of the hypostaseis. For this reason ST. BASIL explains further how the heretics applied this philosophical analysis to Trinitarian dogma. The following passage from the same treatise De Spiritu Sancto, constitutes the ken for understanding. ST. GREGORY'S interpretation of the terms " γενικώτερος " and " εἰδικώτερος ";

" Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν πιστεύοιμι εἰς τοσοῦτον ἀν-  
τὸν παραπληξίας ὑελαύνειν, ὥστε φάναι τὸν θεὸν τῶν ὄλων,  
ὥπερ κοινότητά τινα, λόγῳ μόνῳ θεωρητὴν, ἐν οὐδε-  
μιᾷ δὲ ὑποστάσει τὸ εἶναι ἔχουσιν, εἰς τὰ ὑποκείμενα δια-  
ρεῖσθαι· εἴτα τὴν ὑποδιαίρεσιν ταύτην καὶ ὑπαρίσθησιν λέγεσθαι ".<sup>115</sup>

Two points of this passage must be stressed. (a) The explanation of the unity in God according to Heretics as <sup>being</sup> " λόγῳ μόνῳ θεωρητὴν " is parallel to that one of ST. GREGORY'S attack against the Greeks, " οὐχὶ καὶ παρ' ἑλλήσι ... μία θεότης ... ἀλλ' ὅμως θεοὶ πολλοί, καὶ οὐχ εἷς ... Ἀλλ' εὐεὶ μὲν ἡ κοινότης τὸ ἐν ἔχει μόνον ἐπινόα θεωρητὸν ",<sup>116</sup> and (b) According to philosophical subordination the hypostaseis exist without steady essence; thus ST. BASIL states " ἐν οὐδεμιᾷ δὲ ὑπο-  
στάσει τὸ εἶναι ἔχουσιν ", alternatively to ST. GREGORY'S

refutation of Sabellianism: " φεύγει γὰρ ἂν εἶναι ἅπερ ἔστιν, εἰς ἄλληλα μεταχωροῦντα καὶ μεταβαίνοντα ". 117

In the last analysis ST. GREGORY the terms " γενικώτερος " and " εἰδικώτερος " represent only the contradiction of <sup>his</sup> opponents' thought, while his purpose lies beyond any enumeration and much more any sub-  
enumeration among the Hypostaseis. He uses ST. BASIL'S example of Peter, Paul and John to establish the homocousion which is ever beyond any  
connumeration. 118

In turn ST. GREGORY establishes further the homocousion <sup>by</sup> putting  
into consideration (a) the passage I. John 5.8: " ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρ-  
τυροῦντες, τὸ Πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ ἄρμα, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς ἓν εἰσιν ", 119  
where ST. JOHN numbers together things which are not of the same sub-  
stance, and particularly opposed to the definitions and laws of <sup>the</sup> heretics' grammar. 120 (b) In the case of the crab, which is an animal, an instru-  
ment and a constellation, or also in the case of the dog, which is  
terrestrial, aquatic and celestial we can speak of three things, although  
it is obvious that they are not consubstantial. These two arguments  
overthrow the meaning of connumeration according to the heretics, as it  
is proved that things which are consubstantial are not always reckoned  
under one number, and <sup>further</sup> more, things of a different substance may be  
numbered together " Εἰ γὰρ μήτε τὰ ὁμοούσια πάντως συναριθ-  
μεῖται, καὶ συναριθμεῖται τὰ μὴ ὁμοούσια, ἢ τε τῶν ὀνομάτων συν-  
εμφώνησις ἐπ' ἀμφοῖν, ὥστε πλέον ὢν ἑδοξμάτισα. " 121

Indeed, ST. GREGORY'S intention is to rescue the dogmatic formula-  
tion from an abstract articulation. The final refutation is based on

logical means, which <sup>the</sup> heretics borrowed from the philosophical arsenal, in order that the impossibility of the following syllogism may be proved. ST. GREGORY asks them in a rhetorical way: "Ἐν καὶ τὸ ἓν οὐκ εἰς δύο συντίθενται; τὰ δύο δὲ οὐκ εἰς ἓν ἀναλύεται; δῆλον ὅτι. Εἰ οὖν ὁμοούσια μὲν τὰ συντιθέμενα κατὰ τὸν σὸν λόγον, ἑτερούσια δὲ τὰ τεμνόμενα, τί συμβαίνει, τὰ αὐτὰ ὁμοούσια τε καὶ ἑτερούσια".<sup>122</sup>

Finally he expresses his opinion about the theme of enumeration in the Godhead, as he defines more clearly the heretics' view of pr enumeration or subenumeration. "Γέλῳ σου καὶ τὰς προαριθμήσεις, καὶ τὰς ὑπαριθμήσεις, αἷς οὐ μέγα φρονεῖς, ὥσπερ ἐν τῇ τάξει τῶν ὀνομάτων κειμένων τῶν πραγμάτων",<sup>123</sup> a statement which brings us back to the same point which was <sup>made</sup> in paragr. 12 of the Or. In Sancta Lumina:

"οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν μετέπιπτον αἱ προθέσεις ἢ αἱ ταῖς τῶν ὀνομάτων".<sup>124</sup>

Certainly the whole subject of the enumeration of the Persons of the Holy Trinity derives from philosophical premises,<sup>125</sup> but ST. GREGORY insists on the witness of <sup>the</sup> Scriptures. The continuation of paragr. 20 of the Or. 31 (Theol. 5) is of a paramount importance; the pr enumeration and subenumeration with simultaneous alternation of the order of the Names overthrows any idea of subordination and establishes the homocousion of the Hypostaseis: "Εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο (sc. if the Hypostaseis themselves depended upon the order of their names), τί κωλύνει κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸν λόγον, ἐπειδὴ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ προαριθμεῖσθαι, καὶ ὑπαριθμεῖσθαι παρὰ τῇ θεῇ γραφῇ, διὰ τὴν ἰσοτιμίαν τῆς φύσεως, αὐτὰ ἐάντων εἶναι τιμιώτερα τε καὶ ἀτιμότερα (a syllogism which entails that the adjective "τιμιώτερα" corresponds to "προαριθμεῖσθαι" and the adjective "ἀτιμότερα" to ὑπαριθμεῖσθαι); οὐ δὲ αὐτὸς μοι, καὶ

περὶ τῆς θεοῦ φωτὸς καὶ κυρίου λόγου· ἔτι δὲ τῶν  
προθέσεων, τῆς ἐξ οὐ, καὶ δι' οὐ, καὶ ἐν ᾧ, αἷς οὐ κατα-  
τεχνολογεῖς ἡμῖν τὸ θεῖον, τὴν μὲν τῷ Πατρὶ διδούς, τὴν δὲ τῷ  
Υἱῷ, τὴν δὲ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι. τί γὰρ ἂν ἐποίησας, παχίως ἐ-  
κδοῦναι τούτων ἐκδοτὰν νενεμημένου· ὅποτε πάντων πᾶσι συν-  
τεταγμένων... τοσαύτην σὺ διὰ τούτων εἰσάγεις καὶ τῆς ἀβίας, καὶ τῆς ἐνόςως ἀνισότητος;<sup>126</sup>

This extensive passage proves (a) How essential is the theme of the common names of God and especially the interchange of them among the Persons of the Holy Trinity; b) that ST. GREGORY follows ST. PAUL, to whose authority he appeals, as the latter does not keep the same order among the Hypostaseis, but enumerates the same Hypostas is sometimes as first, sometimes as second, and sometimes as third. The possibility of pr enumeration, enumeration and subnumeration with a simultaneous reverse of the order of James, viz. valid for the three Hypostaseis in the same way, is the proof of the homoousion, which presupposes common and identical nature.<sup>127</sup> (c) Furthermore, ST. PAUL sometimes mentions the three Hypostaseis, but sometimes only two, or one; but even in the case in which only one Hypostas is mentioned we must come to the conclusion, ST. GREGORY says, that <sup>he</sup> who is not mentioned is included by im-  
plication, ὥς ἐπομένου πάντως τοῦ λείποντος".<sup>128</sup> This statement can be interpreted on the basis of the Mystery of the Holy Economy, whereas the manifestation of the Hypostaseis is always economic, a thing that is properly deduced from their particular function in <sup>the</sup> world. For ST. GREGORY, who claims that he interprets ST. PAUL, the alternation also of the divine Operation ("ἐνέργεια") among the Hypostaseis is yet another proof of their identity of nature;<sup>129</sup> as ST. PAUL sometimes attributes the "ἐνέργεια" to the Holy Spirit,<sup>130</sup> and sometimes to the Son.<sup>131</sup>

The point at issue became a common locus in Patristic thought, especially after the Cappadocian Fathers, but its origin is to be found in ST. ATHANASIUS who defended the homoousion and the indivisibility and identity of the Triad on the ground of the one grace common to the three Persons:

"Καὶ λεγομένου τοῦ Πατρὸς, πρόσκειται καὶ ὁ τοῦτου λόγος καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ ὑεῷ Πνεῦμα. Ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὀνομάσῃται, ἐν τῷ ὑεῷ ἔστιν ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκτὸς τοῦ λόγου." <sup>132</sup> As

T. R. MARTLAND pointed out 'An act belonging eminently and officially to a particular trinitarian person is not performed to the exclusion of the other Persons. As the whole undivided essence is in each person so an act via a particular mode is in reality via the three'. <sup>133</sup>

The examination of the economic character, which predominates over the manifestation of the Hypostaseis, is interwoven with the main trinitarian formulation of the "One in Three", and vice versa. <sup>134</sup> Similarly after the problem of connumeration, the "πρότερον" or the "ὕστερον" within God occurs in a double question formulated as an issue about the existence of an "ἁνὸν-σιος" hypostasis or an "ἁνυπόστατος" essence. Again ST. GREGORY appeals to ST. PAUL in order to ascertain the existence of the distinctions and unions in <sup>the</sup> Godhead simultaneously. So, for the distinction of the Hypostaseis he refers to I Cor. 8.6 "Εἰς θεός, λέγοντος, ἔξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν. καὶ εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ", while he appeals to Rom. 11.36 in order to bring together the One Godhead: "Ὅτι ἔξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα". <sup>135</sup> There is a motion among the Persons of the Holy Trinity according to their manifestation <sup>proceeds</sup> in the Holy Economy, which begins from God the Father through the Son and



reaches its end

in the Holy Spirit, as <sup>&</sup> katabasis of God, which <sup>about</sup> brings man's anabasis to God through the Holy Spirit, who establishes the Church. <sup>136</sup>

In fact the ultimate <sup>reference is and</sup> remains the hypostas is of the Father which is communicated or reached by the Son and through the Holy Spirit. This is the reason why the Fathers insisted on an orthodox Trinitarian dogma, as soteriological presupposition of an orthodox anthropology.

The theme had occupied previously ST. ATHANASIUS and ST. BASIL, and was expressed <sup>in</sup> soteriological terms by the former, and Trinitarian by the latter. ST. ATHANASIUS defence of the homocousion <sup>was</sup> based

upon the common energy of God as the love of the Father, the grace of the Son and the communication of the Holy Spirit: "ἡ γὰρ διδομένη χάρις καὶ δωρεὰ ἐν Τριάδι δίδοται παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς δι' υἱοῦ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. ὡς περ γὰρ ἐκ τῶν πατρὸς ἐστὶ δι' υἱοῦ ἡ διδομένη χάρις, οὕτως οὐκ ἐν γένει το κοινωνία τῆς δόξης ἐν ἡμῖν, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ". <sup>137</sup>

For the Christian there is not other way to confess the Holy Trinity except that one through the Holy Spirit, <sup>138</sup> as the Holy Spirit shows us the Son and the Son the Father. <sup>139</sup> More emphatically ST. BASIL

applies this scheme purely to the Trinitarian dogma, which consists of our deeper knowledge of the Holy Trinity ("θεογνωσία"). <sup>140</sup> As

B. BOBRINSKOY noted two kinds of motion exist in this scheme; according to <sup>the</sup> first motion the Holy Spirit is at the beginning of <sup>the</sup> divine function, and works inside man prompting him towards God. So,

He acts inside human history by creating the long series of the just men and patriarchs of Israel, and finally by coming down on Christ, whom the Father reveals. The second motion is that of the trinitarian Revelation, according to which the Holy Spirit brings about



the <sup>completion</sup> of the Economy of the Son at Pentecost, and <sup>fulfilling</sup> thus the purpose of the Incarnation.<sup>141</sup> The justification of this double motion belongs to ST. BASIL who thinks that by this scheme the monarchy of the Father and the trinitarian reality of the Hypostaseis is safeguarded.<sup>142</sup>

On the other hand ST. GREGORY in some way corrects his friend in another aspect. ST. BASIL was succumbed to say "εἰς θεός ὅτι καὶ Πατήρ", while ST. GREGORY stresses simultaneously the singularity of the Godhead: "Ἡμῶν εἰς θεός, ὅτι μία θεότης".<sup>143</sup> On this assumption he follows ST. ATHANASIUS' line centralizing his thought on the unity of <sup>the</sup> Godhead, viz. the homousion, although he admits that this unity has the person of the Father as <sup>the ultimate</sup> point of reference.<sup>144</sup> "Ὡς οὖν

οἰς δὲ ὁ Πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ καὶ πρὸς ὃν ἀνάγεται τὰ ἐξ ἡς".<sup>145</sup>

Of course ST. GREGORY is aware of ORIGEN'S theory about the restoration of all ("ἀποκατάστασις") as well as its acceptance by DIDYMUS,<sup>146</sup> and for this reason he talks strictly against tendencies

of this kind, since the monarchy of the Father might leave space for them. Thus referring to I Cor. 15.28 <sup>he</sup> comments thus: "Ἔσται δὲ ὁ θεός τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσιν, ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς ἀποκαταστάσεως· οὐχ ὁ Πατήρ πάντως εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναχθέντος τῶν υἱοῦ, ὡς εἰς πυρὰν μεγάλην λαμπάδος πρὸς καιρὸν ἀποσπασθείσης, εἴτα συναφθείσης, μηδὲ γὰρ σαβέλλιοι τῷ ἑπτῷ τούτῳ παραφθιρέσθωσαν, ἀλλ' ὅλος θεός, ὅταν μηκέτι πολλὰ ᾖμεν, ὥστε νῦν τοῖς υἱήμασι καὶ τοῖς πάθεσιν, οὐδὲν ὅλως θεοῦ, ἢ ὀλίγον ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς φέροντες, ἀλλ' ὅλοι θεοειδῆς, ὅλου θεοῦ χωρητικοὶ καὶ μόνου· τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ τελείωσις, πρὸς ἣν σπεύδουμεν".<sup>147</sup>

It is obvious that the manifestation of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, although known to us through the Holy Economy, is the corner-stone of the Christian life and this is lex credendi and lex orandi.<sup>148</sup> As the Father is One and "μόνος",<sup>149</sup> there is only one faith, one worship and one baptism.<sup>150</sup> The oneness, as a reality of unity and order, is a commonplace both to Greek thought and the Fathers.<sup>151</sup>

Furthermore, ST. GREGORY says that every one of the three Persons is God, but the three are not separated in Godhead. There is one <sup>divine</sup> nature in three Hypostaseis, which are intellectual, perfect, and self-hypostasized divided in number but not in Godhead. "θεόν τὸν πατέρα, θεόν τὸν υἱόν, θεόν... τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, μίαν φύσιν ἐν τρισὶν ἰδιότησι, νοερᾷς, τελείαις, καθ' ἑαυτὰς ὑφ' ἑωσώσας, ἀριθμῶ διαιρεταῖς καὶ οὐ διαιρεταῖς θεότητι".<sup>152</sup> This passage does in fact outline the solution of the central problem about the "πρότερον" or "ὑστέρον": (a) Among the Hypostaseis, (b) between the Godhead and the Hypostaseis.

Being self-hypostasized every Person bears the common nature and for this reason manifests the other two simultaneously. This means that ST. GREGORY aims the unity, viz. the homousion, <sup>and does</sup> not proceed from it.<sup>153</sup> Thus, although one hypostasis is the principle of the other two, this does not mean that the former is not more God than the latter as the application of a "πρότερον" "ὑστέρον" would imply.<sup>154</sup> The point at issue is of an enormous significance, as it is the link between the necessity of one a principle in <sup>the</sup> Godhead and the retention of the order of the Names of consubstantial Hypostaseis which constitutes another expression of the

homocousion. ST. GREGORY states the distinction of the Hypostaseis without adopting two or three principles, as the ultra-orthodox did;<sup>155</sup> so the problem of the unity and multiplicity in <sup>the</sup> Godhead ~~demand~~s a further elucidation.

As we have already seen ST. GREGORY refuses categorically to apply abstract definitions to the Holy Trinity and his language is bluntly reminiscent of his contemporary or ~~the~~ previous heresies, in the wake of which he suggests orthodox solutions. He militates, on the other hand, against both extremes and sets the orthodox belief not only on Via Media but on the simultaneous and respective departure from Monad and Triad as well. In fact he uses trenchant and well-guarded sentences and approaches the subject from many facets in order to avoid a one-sided definition as <sup>the</sup> heretical sects had done. It is significant that ST. GREGORY always names both parts of the Trinitarian confession, or proceeds to explain them in a corresponding way. The peril of misunderstanding is owed to the weakness of even human mind to conceive purely the Trinitarian reality; for this reason especially the negative method expresses the absolute inadequacy of <sup>both</sup> human language and mind to find the core of a complete interpretation of the Trinitarian God. The weak point of our situation is particularly our temporality, viz. our created nature.<sup>156</sup> God will remain <sup>for us</sup> a most paradoxical reality:

« Νῦν δὲ δίδασκε τοσούτον εἶδέναι μόνον, μονάδα ἐν Τριάδι, καὶ Τριάδα ἐν μονάδι προσκυνουμένην, παράδοξον ἔχουσαν καὶ τὴν δαίρειν καὶ τὴν ἐνωσιν. »<sup>157</sup> Explaining in brief that the distinction and the union in <sup>the</sup> Godhead is of a character beyond reasoning (« παράδοξος ») ST. GREGORY denies any absolute <sup>claim</sup> for human knowledge. In fact the

Trinitarian dogma demands a crucifixion of human mind, viz. it demands of man to pass through the abyss of death.<sup>158</sup> Thus ST. GREGORY'S insistence on the acceptance of the Cross of Christ by the Arians is justified, since they claimed that if Christ was God, His Cross would be the ultimate divine folly. He says that Christ died in vain for such 'unthankful creatures', as the Arians were.<sup>159</sup>

Of course ST. GREGORY, a deeply educated person, was well acquainted with the proclivity of the heretical sects for a dialectical explanation by the means of Philosophy and for this reason he insists on <sup>the</sup> impalpable facet of the Dogma. In the last analysis the intellect has the possibility to go over its limits only through the revelation of God, as even the clearness of the number cannot surpass the deficiency of human reality.

Thus, he says, in his poem De Spiritu Sancto, that God is not a Monad, which is characterized as numberless ("ᾠρηθμος"), because He consists in Three Gods; and He is not Triad ("πολυσεντος"), since the divine nature is unbroken ("ἀκέραιος").<sup>160</sup> The final purpose of this last oxymoron wording is to exclude mathematical definition; for <sup>reason</sup> this he introduces in turn a kind of mathematical antinomy: "Ἡ μονὰς ἐν θεότητι, τὰ δ' ὧν ἡ θεότης τρισάριθμα",<sup>161</sup> which means that this antinomic use of number does not entail mathematical development from one to two and then to three. This should leave space for many principles and gods tantamount to polytheism.<sup>162</sup> Furthermore, for ST. GREGORY polytheism is equal to atheism, viz. the disbelief in any first cause, as "οὐκ ἔστιν γὰρ πολὺάρχων ἐμὸν καὶ πᾶσαν ἀναρχον".<sup>163</sup>

And ST. BASIL notices, when our Lord manifested, (according to Matth. 28.19) Himself, <sup>he</sup> talked exactly ~~about~~ the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; he did not state any number with them. <sup>164</sup> Further on in the same chapt. 18, ST. BASIL is more explicit; he condemns the mathematical enumeration in <sup>the</sup> Godhead as <sup>a</sup> "παρὰ λόγον", viz. <sup>a</sup> numerical addition of one Person to another, which leads to subordination. <sup>165</sup> On the other hand we find the same articulation in ST. GREGORY'S thought, who, however, begins from another point; in his fifth Theological Oratio he faces the problem of the possibility of using illustrations for describing the Trinitarian dogma. So, the threefold illustration of Source - Spring - Stream, ST. GREGORY explains, although it might be applied to the expression of <sup>the</sup> unity and triplicity in <sup>the</sup> Godhead, since it presupposes a reality beyond time and separation, it may lead to a serious peril by considering "πρῶτον μὲν εἶπω τινὰ θεότητος παραδείξασθαι ἵνα οὐκ ἔχουσιν" <sup>166</sup> which means acceptance of the numerical identity of substance, tantamount to Greek polytheism. <sup>167</sup>

As V. LOSSKY pointed out 'The church has defended so vehemently the mystery of the Holy Trinity against the natural tendencies of the human mind, which strive to suppress it by reducing the Trinity to unity, in making it an essence of the philosophers with three modes of manifestation (the modalism of Sabellius), or even by dividing it into three distinct beings, as did Arius'. <sup>168</sup> For example, he says <sup>that</sup> if we applied the idea of number to God we would submit divinity to an exterior determination, in some way proper to our understanding. <sup>169</sup> ST. GREGORY, as we have already noticed, used the adjective "πὰρὰ λόγον" (sc. beyond reasoning), for the antinomic formula "Μονὰς ἐν Τριάδι" and

vice versa, in order to stress the simultaneous existence of 'distinctions' and 'unions' in <sup>the</sup> Godhead.<sup>170</sup> "Τοσούτον εἶδέναι μόνον, μονάδα ἔν Τριάδι, καὶ Τριάδα ἔν μονάδι προσκυνούμενν, παρὰ δὲ τὸν ἔχουσιν καὶ τὴν διαίρεσιν καὶ τὴν ἔνωσιν."<sup>171</sup> Therefore it is not right to describe the Trinitarian relations under a mathematical analogy because the unity in <sup>the</sup> Godhead is not of a numerical identity but of <sup>an</sup> essential one, and the divine nature is simple, indivisible and without parts.<sup>172</sup>

Thus, <sup>the</sup> views of G. L. PRESTIGE and M. A. ORPHANOS about a kind of mathematical equation in the articulation of the Trinitarian dogma must be rejected. PRESTIGE, referring to MAXIMUS the CONF. in a passage where the latter comments on the meaning of the motion of the Monad in ST. GREGORY,<sup>173</sup> summarizes the point thus: 'The sum 'God + God + God' adds up, not to '3 Gods', but simply to 'God', because the word God, as applied to each Person distinctly, expresses a Totum and Absolute which is incapable of increment either in quantity or in quality'.<sup>174</sup>

But from ST. MAXIMUS' passage to which PRESTIGE refers, there cannot be claimed any idea of 'sum' or addition, not only in an equational way wherein the first part, viz. the 'sum God + God + God', might have been put, but in the second, viz. the 'One God', because according to ST. MAXIMUS it is impossible to apply the idea of a number even to Trinitarian relations. This very important passage runs as follows: "Μονὰς γὰρ ἀληθῶς ἡ Μονάς· οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἀρχή



τῶν μετ' αὐτήν, κατὰ διαστολῆς οὐστολῆν, ἵνα χεθῇ φησικῶς εἰς ὡλήθος ὁδενύουσα, ἀλλ' ἐνυπόστατος ὀντότης ὁμοουσίου Τριάδος. Καὶ Τριάς ἀληθῶς ἡ Τριάς οὐκ ἀριθμῶ ληνομένων συμπληρου- μένη (οὐ γάρ ἐστι μονάδων σύνθεσις, ἵνα πάθῃ διαίρεσιν), ἀχ' ἐνού- σιος ὑπαρξίς τρισυποστάτου μονάδος. Μονὰς γὰρ ἀληθῶς ἡ Τριάς οὐ οὕτως ἐστὶ, καὶ Τριάς ἀληθῶς ἡ μονὰς, ὅτι οὕτως ὑφέστηκεν. Ἐπειδὴ καὶ μία θεότης οὐσά τε μοναδικῶς, καὶ ὑφιστάμενη Τριάδῳ<sup>175</sup>

In this passage five points might be stressed: (a) the univocity of the Monad, (b) the univocity of the Triad, (c) the simultaneous existence of the Monad and the Triad, (d) the exclusion of numerical expressions, (e) the safeguard confessional-formula "Μονὰς ἐν Τριάδι" <sup>which</sup> and vice versa, preserves the antinomic character of the orthodox dogma, i.e. the "παράδοξον", which the Arians denied as illogical.

When ST. GREGORY speaks of God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Spirit, he insists on the univocity of Each of Them in order to dispel any idea of another Father, Son or Holy Spirit, in accordance with the traditional line of ST. ATHANASIUS,<sup>176</sup> "Μῆτε ἀγέννητον τὸν υἱόν, εἷς γὰρ ὁ Πατήρ· μῆτε υἱὸν τὸ πνεῦμα, εἷς γὰρ ὁ Μονογε- νής· ἵνα καὶ τὸν το θεῖον ἔχωσι τὸ μοναδικόν",<sup>177</sup> or as he states further "Ἐνα μὲν εἰδέναι θεόν ἀγέννητον τὸν πατέρα· ἕνα δὲ γεννητὸν κύριον, τὸν υἱόν... ἐν δὲ πνεῦμα ἅγιον".<sup>178</sup> Of course the "μοναδικότης" of the Persons is based on the "μοναδικόν" of the essence, viz. the homousion,<sup>179</sup> and the One Godhead; they are not three Gods.<sup>180</sup> It must be noted that ST. GREGORY, like all the <sup>orthodox</sup> Fathers, even when he has to discuss philosophical terms, <sup>he does</sup> mentions side by side the concrete belief of the church about the manifestation of God throughout



the Holy Economy.<sup>181</sup> So, when he uses the word "εἷς" or "έν," he mentions the name of the Father, the Son or the Holy Spirit, or the name "θεός" without the conjunction "καί", thus: "θεόν τόν Πατέρα, θεόν τόν Υἱόν, θεόν, εἰ μὴ τραχύνη, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον".<sup>182</sup> In fact, the further refutation of the philosophical and abstract definitions, which the heretics applied to Godhead, is indebted to ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA, who dealt especially with the rejection of the accusation of trétheia<sup>directed</sup> against the Cappadocian Fathers; he is explicit about the meaning of the name "θεός". "Τῷ δὲ θεὸς ὀνόματι δηλωτικῶς τῆς οὐσίας ὄντι ἕκ τινος ἰδιώματος προσόντος αὐτῆς, οὐ συνδωτομεν τὸν καὶ σύνδεσμον, ὥστε λέγειν ἡμᾶς θεόν καὶ θεόν καὶ θεόν· ἐπεὶ περ ἡ αὐτὴ ἔστ' οὐσία ἢ ἔστι τὰ πρόσωπα, καὶ ἡν σημαίνει τὸ θεὸς ὄνομα· δὴ καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς ὁ θεός. Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ ἐπιδηλώσει τοῦ αὐτοῦ οὐ συμβλέκεται ποτέ"<sup>183</sup>

Thus in the formula God + God + God = God there is the logical mistake to reckon A + A + A = A, instead of the right form A = A, a thing that even the Arians denied as illogical;<sup>184</sup> Godhead is perfect and every Person is perfect.<sup>185</sup> This was the main argument against the Arians and the Pneumatomachians, who denied the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit respectively. ST. GREGORY follows ST. ATHANASIUS,<sup>186</sup> doctrine again, and in some way he is in opposition to ST. BASIL and the Fathers of the Second Ecumenical Council, whose decisions are characterized by an intention of moderation towards the Pneumatomachians.

The point needs further examination, but first of all we must summarize ST. GREGORY'S particular purpose in his attempt to formulate the orthodox belief in order to safeguard his congregation

from heresies.<sup>187</sup>

(a) He emphasizes the paradoxical character of the orthodox belief by the confessional type "Μονὰς Ἐν Τριάδι" and vice versa, against a pure logical articulation of dogma in philosophical terms advanced by the heretics.<sup>188</sup>

(b) The homousion is the word by which the divinity of the Hypostaseis may be confessed.

(c) For this <sup>reason</sup> the Holy Spirit is "θεός," as well as the Father and the Son.<sup>189</sup> ST. GREGORY is the Father who established especially the "ἐκπορευτόν", as the mode of existence of the Holy Spirit.<sup>190</sup>

Surely ST. GREGORY was the protagonist of the preparation for the second Ecumenical Council; nevertheless the Fathers of the Council adopted a doctrine more conservative <sup>than this,</sup> and we should say, on ST. BASIL'S lines<sup>191</sup> or in some way <sup>literally</sup> more <sup>scriptural</sup>. As J. KARMIRES<sup>192</sup> noted the terminology, which the Fathers used, in the eighth article of the Credo, is based upon scriptural words, as the word "Κύριον",<sup>193</sup> "ζωοποιόν",<sup>194</sup> and "ἐκπορευόμενον",<sup>195</sup> and <sup>does not</sup> to use the term "ὁμοούσιον" for the Holy Spirit in order that <sup>to avoid the</sup> accusation of employing SABELLIUS' framework. On the other hand we may speak of a "θεολογικὴ οἰκονομία", the same with that one by which ST. ATHANASIUS faced the homoeousians and ST. BASIL the Pneumatomachians.<sup>196</sup> In the Credo the Holy Spirit, as P. EUDOKIMOV<sup>197</sup> pointed out, is defined liturgically by the preposition "σύν", as a consequence of the role of the Holy Spirit in the sacramental life of the Christians,<sup>198</sup> as "τελειωτής".<sup>199</sup>

On the other hand ST. GREGORY made public his belief that the Holy Spirit is God ("θεός") and homocousion<sup>200</sup> to the Father and the Son, especially in the very crucial years 379-380, which marked the final triumph of a long spiritual straggle, which started in 372-373<sup>201</sup> with a letter<sup>sent</sup> to ST. BASIL<sup>202</sup> In this<sup>letter</sup> ST. GREGORY defends ST. BASIL'S orthodoxy about which some monkish sects were cautious, prompting him also to declare his belief publicly in the divinity and the homocousion of the Holy Spirit. It seems that ST. BASIL became sad because of this interference of his friend, but he did change his position.<sup>203</sup> It seems also that the Second Ecumenical Council followed a moderate line, with which ST. GREGORY did not agree, and after the deliverence of the Orat. Supremum Vale, coram centum quinquaginta episcopis<sup>he</sup> returned to his country estate, but without ceasing to explain his position. In his Epist. 101 to Cleodnius he asserts that he follows the Fathers of Nicaea, who had not exposed the doctrine about the divinity and the homocousion of the Holy Spirit since a theme of this kind had not occupied them. "Ὅτι ἡμεῖς τῆς κατὰ Νίκαιαν πίστεως... οὐδὲν οὔτε προετιμήσαμεν πώποτε οὔτε προτιμᾶν δυνάμεθα, ἀλλ' ἐκείνης ἔσμεν τῆς πίστεως σὺν θεῷ καὶ ἑσόμεθα, προσδιαθροῦντες τὸ ἔχει πῶς ἐξηγημένον ἐκείνοις περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος (διὰ τὸ μηδὲ κεκινῆσθαι τῆς κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ ζήτημα), ὅτι μίας θεότητος εἶδέναι χρὴ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, θεὸν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα γινώσκοντες"<sup>204</sup>.

Of course after the final decision of the Pneumatomachians to conform with the church's doctrine, ST. GREGORY'S theology became the canon of impeccable orthodoxy.

By way of conclusion we may summarize as follows the results of our examination concerning the possibility of formulating the Trinitarian dogma.

1. By the scheme "<sup>1</sup>Μονὰς ἑντρίδι" and vice versa, the doctrine of (a) the unity of the divine essence, and (b) the triplicity of the Hypostaseis, is maintained whilst the paradoxical character of the orthodox dogma is preserved.
2. The orthodox belief lies on a Via Media.
3. The biblical and economic revelation of God knows the Trinitarian dogma in terms of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.
4. The <sup>key to the</sup> union (" <sup>α</sup>ἐνωσις ") of the Son and the Holy Spirit is the Hypostasis of the Father.
5. The Hypostaseis are real.
6. The <sup>property</sup> distinctive <sup>γ</sup> of each Hypostasis is unchangeable.
7. The name of each Person entails the presence of the Other Two, without any confusion or coalescence.
8. The Hypostaseis are divided without division and they are united in division [ " Παράδοξος διαίρεσις καὶ ἑνωσις " ]  
Or. 25.17 P.G. 35, 1221D.
9. The substance is indivisible and uniform and without parts.

10. The Hypostaseis have the same will, kingdom, power, energy, glory.
11. The alternation of the prepositions "ἐξ οὗ", "δι' οὗ", "ἐν ᾧ", as well as the reverse of the order of the Names state the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit.
12. The term which safeguards the substantial unity of the three Hypostaseis is the word "ὁμοούσιον".
13. The term which safeguards the confession of the divinity of the Holy Spirit is the appellation "θεός".

## CHAPTER VI

### TRINITARIAN IMAGES

Having explained the scheme "Μονὰς ἑν Τριὰδι" and vice versa so as to say that this is a wording of a kind and class equal to that of homocousion, we must now add that it should be distinguished from the so called 'image-expressions' which have been used by the Philosophers as well as by some Fathers in order to communicate the Trinitarian faith by means of symbols. Language itself is of a symbolic character, whereas the image ("Εἰκὼν") has a bipolar meaning; as DR. KOUTRAS<sup>1</sup> has pointed out, an image lies before or beyond the conception of a thing,<sup>2</sup> as for example in the case of primitive symbols which describe abstract notions. On the other hand the image is used by aesthetics and logic as an extension bypassing the weakness of language and manifesting transcendent reality and philosophical meditation.<sup>3</sup> We are indebted to Plato for the notion of "διάνοια" and its function in the procedure of the human spirit. According to his ResPub 510e,<sup>4</sup> it seems that "διάνοια" rather than "νόησις" uses images for grasping the principles, and, as J. A. NOTOPOULUS<sup>5</sup> has shown, the former is inferior to the latter. This depends upon the nature of the image-symbol, as its effectiveness presupposes a prior experience and knowledge, a 'context of reference'.<sup>6</sup> Of course the perfect knowledge belongs to God himself "καὶ ἀνδρῶν ὅς ἄν ἐκείνῳ φίλος ᾖ"

a premise amazingly common both to the Greek Philosophers and the Greek Fathers with the only difference that in Christian belief man cannot reach the absolute knowledge;<sup>7</sup> that means that for the Christian the purpose is different. For the Christian dogma the adoption of illustrative expressions led to the use of icons whereas the purpose remains purely soteriological. The ultimate recognition of the "πράγματα" preserves a belief in God who is beyond the abstract formulations of pure intellectual achievements.<sup>8</sup> Consonant with this view is the symbol in its artificial form.<sup>9</sup> Thus the Myth in PLATO is attuned to dialogue, but simultaneously it is an approach of pure intellectual principles beyond the bondage of the human "λόγος"<sup>10</sup> which looks to knowledge on the level of the soul ("ἐλλογος ψυχὴ"). Later on PHILO, adapted with the aid of Greek philosophy and particularly of PLATO, the flight of the perceptible world to the idea of the transcendent God. The Neoplatonists and especially PLOTINUS, are deeply indebted to PHILO.<sup>11</sup> Not much later after PHILO PLUTARCH employs the platonic myths in his work but for him the main problem remained that of the soul. More to the point, PLOTINUS is the most genuine of PLATO'S successors although he moved from the Platonic myth to an interior dialogue with himself in order to reach the noetic reality. He is open to the usage of image,<sup>12</sup> and further, to the usage of analogy, but this method does not orientate towards an explanation of the perceptible world, since it is only a hypothesis; the perceptible world is a genuine reflection of the noetic reality. Only by similitude is it possible to ascend to the ultimate noetic things. The existence of a unity is



claimed in order that the images should not have been arbitrary or at least eccentric.<sup>13</sup> For this reason we might say that PLOTINUS considers the One as the origin of being (  $\theta\upsilon$  ),<sup>14</sup> which is manifested in a series of reflections and degrees.

On the other hand the Fathers, for fear of neglecting the biblical content of the Christian belief, first and foremost put to use elements of secular learning to serve the apologetic task or to define the heresy; even the Apologists who claimed that Christian doctrines, particularly those about the world and immortality, are loci of the philosophy as well, then adhered to the belief that 'the Revelation is the perfection of Common Sense.'<sup>15</sup> In addition, it is indisputable, that the Fathers grappled with the Trinitarian and Christological dogma and focused their definition, explicitly or implicitly on the affirmation rather than the explanation of the paradoxical features of both.<sup>16</sup> This was the only way to bring the data of human history under subjection for use in the Mystery of the Holy Dispensation. For this reason illustrations such as those of light and eye, word and voice, thought and mind have been used by the Fathers of the Alexandrian or Antiochene theological tendency,<sup>17</sup> in order to defend the union in Christ without separation and change, and the ultimate paradox of the incarnation.

A very similar method has been followed in the case of Trinitarian dogma, which might have been defined as the paradox of the identity of unity and multiplicity. As far as we know for certain ST. GREGORY with respect to Trinitarian wordings held a position which can be called a Via Media; in actuality he recognizes the inbred weakness

of human thought and experience to marry its logic with the paradox of the Trinitarian doctrine. He is generally content with safeguarding the terms rather than with an entire articulation of Christian belief. Having distinguished the uncreated ( "ἀκτιστόν" ) Trinitarian God from the created world ( "κτιστόν" ) ST. GREGORY does not omit to look into the meaning of the Trinitarian illustrations ( "ἐκδύες" ) and admittedly he tackles it by following a previous tradition<sup>18</sup> in a paragraph remarkable for its insight. At the very beginning he states the particular method applied to the investigation of a thing which belongs to the achievements of Greek Philosophy, and especially the analogical interpretation of the divine hypostaseis by the Neoplatonists;<sup>19</sup> this method is of a bipolar character as it presupposes simultaneously a philosophical and theological outlook. ST. GREGORY underlines as its primary factor the procedure with which a philosopher would have been particularly content,<sup>20</sup> whereby the philosopher having bypassed the insatiable forms of dialectic, establishes a dialogue with himself;<sup>21</sup> here he is categorical: "πολλὰ διασηγάμενος πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν τὰ φιλοπραγμοσύνη τοῦ νοῦ",<sup>22</sup> but further on he betrays the patristic method of the Via Media, when he says "καὶ πανταχόθεν τὸν λόγον ἐξθύνας"<sup>23</sup> (where the verb "ἐξθύνω" means that he keeps the discussion in a consecutive way in order not to avoid deviation from the middle road to the extreme ). This interpretation might constitute the link between

paragraph XXX and XXXI of Oration 31, and the point at issue, from the search for the Appellation of the Holy Spirit to Trinitarian images, in order that it might have a plausible justification. In concrete terms, paragraph 30 ends with the aphorism of extremes:

" ὁμοῖον γὰρ εἰς ἀσέθειαν, καὶ διαβεβήτως συν-  
ἀψαι, καὶ Ἀρειανῶς<sup>24</sup> διαστῆσαι, τὸ μὲν τῷ προσώπῳ,  
τὸ δὲ ταῖς φύσεσιν" <sup>25</sup>

and, of course, its parallel orthodox asset is ST. GREGORY'S method of Via Media<sup>26</sup> in the beginning of paragraph 31 by the participle of the verb " εὐθύνω " . We must consider this expositional statement as a kind of theological presupposition, a theme that characterizes ST. GREGORY'S method when he has the intention to theologize. In turn the problem at issue appears but with a deductive solution, namely, although he posits as the subject of study the finding of some image to illustrate such a great thing as God, however he immediately comes to the conclusion that it is impossible to find an earthly thing ( " τῶν κάτω " ) with which the divine nature ( " ἡ θεία φύσις " ) might be compared. At last, although reluctant, he feels obliged to tackle his urgent conclusion in order to justify it, with the consequence indeed of facing ironically the " φιλοπραγμοσύνη " of his mind, because even in the case that a likeness ( " ὁμοίωσις " ) might have been found, ST. GREGORY confesses that the human being cannot conceive the greater part ( " τὸ πλεόν " ) which escapes him " ἄρ' ἐν κάτω " by the illustrations of his mind! I believe that here ST. GREGORY makes an allusion to <sup>the</sup> analogical illustrations used by Greek Philosophers and especially by those of middle-Platonism. Surely in comparison with

the use of the appellations ( "κλήσεις" ), for example those which prove the divinity of the Holy Spirit, the Trinitarian illustrations are considered absolutely inadequate to express the biblical belief in God and the methodological ethos of a Christian theologian. Although we have already seen the significance of the Divine Names, it is no exaggeration to say that ST. GREGORY characterizes the " κλήσεις " of the Holy Spirit, in paragraph 30, by the adjective " ἐμψυχός " (living), as he had also expressed his feelings of divine awe, in paragraph 29, for such an abundance of Appellations ( "κλήσεις" ) and described the resistance to the Holy Spirit as an action of impudent people: " καὶ καθ' ὅσων ὀνομάτων ἀναίσχυν- τοῦσιν οἱ τῷ πνεύματι ἀντιπίπτοντες ".<sup>27</sup> We may say furthermore that all these " κλήσεις " manifest exactly the function of the Holy Spirit through the unique Mystery of the Holy Dispensation, a thing consonant with the final statement in the last paragraph XXXIII of the same oration which reaffirms the belief in the Trinitarian God of Revelation. The believer is prompted to leave the images ( " εἰκόνες " )<sup>28</sup> and the shadows ( " σκιά " ) behind him,<sup>29</sup> which means that he must leave everything that might be simply a mere human attempt on the level of intellectual and speculative achievement, in order to rest only on a few words under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.<sup>30</sup> Immediately after this appeal to the biblical phrase of " ὁλίγων ρημάτων ", the most important point is the centralization of all on the worship of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, " τὴν μίαν θεότητα τε καὶ δύναμιν ",<sup>31</sup> a confession of orthodox belief with which the most profound of ST. GREGORY'S orations, the fifth, ends. It is worth noting that

the general texture of this aspect is reminiscent of ST. PAUL I Cor.

14. 18-19, "ἀλλ' ἐν ἑκκλησίᾳ θέλω πέντε λόγους τῷ νοῦ μου λαλῆσαι, ἵνα καὶ ἄλλους κατηχήσω, ἢ κυρίους λόγους ἐν γλώσσῃ".

On the other hand ST. GREGORY does not omit to refute in detail the use of Trinitarian illustrations by previous ecclesiastical authors to whom he refers as "καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἄλλοι".<sup>32</sup> Of course it is difficult to say which authors ST. GREGORY has in mind; the solution which ELIAS CRETENSIS suggests is that ST. GREGORY adumbrates the third apocryphal Epistle by St. Peter<sup>33</sup> in Clementina; although it is not improbable, nevertheless we must take into account the whole Patriotic tradition for two reasons:

(a) In J.B. COTELERIUS' text there is no triune articulation of the image-source, as in ST. GREGORY, who is explicit about a localization of trinitarian analogy. The two parallel passages run thus:

ST. GREGORY'S: "Ὁφθαλμόν τινα, καὶ πηγὴν, καὶ ποταμόν ἐν-  
ετόνισα, καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἄλλοι, μὴ τῷ μὲν ὁ πατήρ, τῇ δὲ  
ὁ υἱός, τὸ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἀναλόγως ἔχη".

CLEMENTINA: "ὥς καὶ τῇ πηγῇ τὸν ποταμόν συνεπινοοῦμεν.  
οὕτως νοητέον καὶ ἐπὶ πατρός καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύμα-  
τος."

It is obvious that the Clementine passage is a preliminary form of that by St. Gregory. Moreover there is a different purpose in each

of them, or at least a different aspect of the same illustration. Indeed as it will be proved in its turn, ST. GREGORY, beginning cautiously will end with the exclusion of this illustration from the Trinitarian wording; whereas the author of the Clementine passage is mainly positive to the analogy. It might be argued quite rightly that the conclusion of the Clementina corresponds rather to the psychological image of Mind - Word - Speech, which the unknown author explains in the beginning of the same epistle,<sup>34</sup> than to the couple fountain - river. In this case we might find a more direct connection with ST. ATHANASIUS than with CLEMENTINA. As S. PAPADOPOULOS<sup>35</sup> pointed out ST. ATHANASIUS adopted the illustration of a fountain - river for the Father and the Son,<sup>36</sup> but we cannot find anywhere in ST. ATHANASIUS' work a third element of this illustration that might consist of a deliberate trinitarian image. Furthermore it must be noticed that ST. ATHANASIUS uses the image of fountain - river for defending the homocousion of the Son.<sup>37</sup> On the contrary ST. GREGORY is aware of an analogical meaning that these terms render the triple scheme, source - fountain - river, and for this reason he insists on expounding in depth the consequences of this usage for the orthodox trinitarian dogma.

(b) Likewise we cannot be sure if ST. GREGORY, by the "ἀλλοι" refers to TERTULLIAN'S work "Adversus Praxeam,"<sup>38</sup> where the threefold image spring - stream - river had been used to imply subordination<sup>39</sup> but without withdrawing the consubstantiality of the Son and the Holy Spirit, - a point familiar to the use of analogy later on by AUGUSTINE<sup>40</sup> in whose theology at the beginning of any explanation the concept of



ONE God is primarily emphasized so that the nature comes before the persons;<sup>41</sup> of course an opinion like this is to a large extent open to analogy and represents an attempt to arrive at any knowledge of God by means of images of Himself present in His Creation.<sup>42</sup>

A. Returning to the point at issue, we need to examine ST. GREGORY'S explanation of the image of "ὁφθαλμός" <sup>43</sup> - "πηγή" - "ποταμός". Without doubt ST. GREGORY focuses his attention on the possibility, or rather on the likelihood, of grasping The Holy Trinity by a kind of analogical knowledge of the persons "Μὴ τῷ μὲν (sc. ὁφθαλμῷ) ὁ πατήρ, τῇ δὲ (sc. πηγῇ) ὁ υἱός, τῷ δὲ (sc. ποταμῷ) τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἀναλόγως ἔχῃ" <sup>44</sup>. His preference of this image is justified by two reasons whereby any idea of either subordination or abrogation of the homocousion is met:

(a) In the case of the analogy source - fountain - river no distinction in time is suggested ("τὰντα γὰρ οὐτε χρόνον διέστηκεν").<sup>45</sup> Had this been so, temporality would have been introduced into the Godhead and consequently the coeternity of the God with the Universe would have been inferred. This stands in contradiction to ST. GREGORY'S explicit statement according to which "χρόνον γὰρ ἀπὸ θεοῦ τέμνόμεθα";<sup>46</sup> If this was not the case, at least a kind of Arian subordination involving a temporal hypostatization of the Divine Persons would be the consequence.

(b) In addition, the consubstantiality of these three is stressed as they are in connection without distinction, although "δοκεῖ πως τριῶν ἰδιότοι τέμνεσθαι".<sup>47</sup> Certainly by this latter phrase, and particularly by the verb "δοκεῖ" with the indefinite



particle "πως", the refutation of the usage of this image is introduced. In turn, the verb "ἐδείσα" is an expected consequence which verifies ST. GREGORY'S strict reservation about the adoption of concrete trinitarian illustrations. More apposite to the topic under discussion is ST. GREGORY'S following considerations:

(a) There is a peril in admitting an incessant flow in the Godhead ("ὁ γὰρ οὐκ ἔχουσιν"),<sup>48</sup> whereby the Christian trinitarian dogma and belief about cosmology might have been construed in Neoplatonic terms, because this could reduce the belief in the Holy Trinity to a subject of the human mind, as it happened this has been done in the case of Arius.

(b) The second argument is obviously a direct attack against Sabellianism. ST. GREGORY who is more vigorous about this point, says that whereas the infinitive "παράδεξασθαι", (immediately dependent on the verb "ἐδείσα"), expresses a kind of moderate fear, the subjunctive "μὴ εἰσαίηται" implies reservation, prevention and even a final command. For this reason he feels more forced to explain his position as follows:

"Ὁφθαλμὸς γάρ, καὶ πηγὴ, καὶ ποταμὸς ἐν ᾧ εἶστιν ἀριθμῶ, διαφόρως σχηματιζόμενα"<sup>49</sup>

The statement is of paramount importance for the refutation of the trinitarian modalism of SABELLIUS as well as for the exclusion of any idea of numerical identity in the Godhead. It means that Sabellianism abrogates the identity of the substance in the Godhead,

exactly by emphasizing the numerical identity, that it reaffirms for one more time the fact that every such heresy constitutes a grave danger in the Church, because it supports an exaggerated accentuation of the particularities. Consequently the whole of ST. GREGORY'S theology must be considered as an expression of the incessant attempt of the spiritual leaders in the Church to define what heresy is without producing a detailed articulation of ecclesiastical belief which might in the end become yet another exaggeration. On the contrary paradoxical language is employed to protect the Patristic tradition of the faith from the extremes of the heretics. We may then say that ST. GREGORY'S goal explicitly or implicitly is simply the exposure of the heresy of Sabellius as well as that of Arius. Such a dogmatic purpose comes to view most characteristically in his poem De Spiritu sancto, which we have cited several times. Having introduced the biblical manifestation of the Divine Persons ST. GREGORY brings forward the orthodox belief summed up in the well known paradoxical scheme: "Ἐκ μονάδος Τριάς ἐστὶ, καὶ ἔκ Τριάδος μὴς ἀνθρῶς" <sup>50</sup>

which order contrasts to the heretical extremes; here we find again his reflection on the analogical image of 'spring': "οὐτε πόρος <sup>51</sup> πηγῇ, ποταμὸς μέγας, ἐν τῷ πρῶτον, ἐν Τρισσοῖσι τυ- ποισιν ἔχωνό μενον κατὰ γαίης", <sup>52</sup> In this poetical wording we find the theme against Sabellianism and Arianism alike. <sup>53</sup>

It is not necessary to discuss the problem of a probable dependence of this poem, which is included among the so called 'POEMATA ARCANAE', <sup>54</sup>

upon the Theological Orations as KEYDELL suggested.<sup>55</sup> Probably D. A. SYKES' view<sup>56</sup> which regards the two parallel passages as independent of each other is the right one not only because the treatment of the subject is different but also because late dating of the poems suggests a divergence both in style and even dogmatic content.

(B) However, we still have to tackle the fact that the rest of the Trinitarian illustrations which, as that of source - fountain - stream, are regarded by ST. GREGORY as wholly inadequate to express the Trinitarian reality; Paragraph 37 of the Fifth Theological oration is a continuation of the whole discussion. The illustration of the 'sun-ray and light' is judged to be inadequate on the basis of dogmatic considerations. Here ST. GREGORY seems to diverge from ST. ATHANASIUS who had used this illustration to defend the coequality of the Divine Persons against Marcionism and Manichaeism.<sup>57</sup> This view is closely related to that of TERTULLIAN, who previously had used this image in order to assert the consubstantiality of the Son and the Spirit,<sup>58</sup> without however dispensing with the problem of subordinationism in the Godhead. This subject is also connected with Apollinarianism. A. THEODOROU pointed out<sup>59</sup> that APOLLINARIUS used the illustration of light-ray and sun in a quantitative manner, to speak of the Trinity. ST. GREGORY witnesses to this in his Epist. 101 where he supplies the following Apollinarian schematizations:

thus:

(a)	Great	(Μέγα)	Light	(αὐγή)	⇒ Ἁγ. Πνεῦμα	
(b)	Greater	(Μεῖζον)	Ray	(ἀκτίς)	⇒ Ὑψός	
(c)	Greatest	(Μέγιστον)	Sun	(ἥλιος)	⇒ Πατήρ	60

ST. GREGORY finds this schematization as a threat to the divinity of the Holy Spirit, since it contains a Trinitarian subordinationism which destroys the equality of the three divine Persons. J. A. DORNER<sup>61</sup> has argued that this scheme possibly derives from Arianism.

ST. GREGORY'S particular attack against APOLLINARIUS as a heretic who reduces the divinity of the Holy Spirit to a vacuous nominalism is particularly interesting in view of the well known fact that APOLLINARIUS' major concern was the Person of Christ. It is obvious that DORNER'S explanation could be combined with ST. GREGORY'S view.

APOLLINARIUS may have borrowed the scheme from Arianism but the fact remains that he used it to deny the full divinity of the Holy Spirit. It is this last point that ST. GREGORY sets out to defend and he does it by stressing the homocousion of the Holy Trinity.

ST. GREGORY feels that since the Fathers of the Nicene Council defended completely the doctrine about the Son, it is his obligation to crystallize the doctrine of the Church about the Holy Spirit,<sup>62</sup> and expose APOLLINARIUS or any other Pneumatomachian who did not extend the homocousion to include the Holy Paraclete. APOLLINARIUS

did confess faith in the Holy Spirit but " τὴν δυνάμιν  
τῆς θεότητος οὐκ ἐφύλαξε".<sup>63</sup> This statement  
of ST. GREGORY is consonant with the testimony of ST. GREGORY OF  
NYSSA which informs us that APOLLINARIUS was an opponent of ARIUS,  
who adhered to the strict Nicene doctrine of the homousion, but  
at the same time seems to have held a Sabellian Triadology.<sup>64</sup>

This is also confirmed by THEODORETUS who notes APOLLINARIUS'  
particular failure in Trinitarian theology: " καὶ... περὶ τῆς  
θείας φύσεως κιθάρῃσι ἐκφασάτο λόγοις, βαθμούς τινας ἀξιωματῶν γεννήσας".<sup>65</sup>

As regards the inadequacy of the image of the sun - ray - light  
for Triadology, ST. GREGORY supplies two reasons. The first one  
is a vigorous criticism of Stoicism, whereas the second constitutes  
an attack on both Apollinarism and to Neoplatonism. As regards the  
first reason ST. GREGORY believes that a danger lies in this

illustration (" καὶ ταῦτα δὲος" ) in as much as it may imply  
that the uncompounded nature (" ἀσύνθετος φύσις" ) involves a  
kind of composition (" σύνθεσις τις" ), " ὥσπερ ἡλίου καὶ  
τῶν ἐν ἡλίῳ ".<sup>66</sup> MASON<sup>67</sup> is right that this interpretation

derives from 'the science of GR'S time which propounded a particular  
connection between the sun itself and the ray and the light which were  
"in the Sun."<sup>68</sup> But, we must also add that this theory also belongs

to <sup>the</sup> Epicurians and had a fixed place in the Stoic cosmological system.<sup>69</sup>

It seems that ST. GREGORY'S argument reflects ORIGEN'S refutation of  
these two philosophical tendencies in his treatise Contra Celsum IV.

15.4, where Christian and pagan beliefs are expounded side by side;

even ORIGEN'S phraseology is very close to that of ST. GREGORY'S:

"ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν καὶ τὰ θεῖα γράμματα  
παρίστανεν ἀτρεπτον λέγοντα τὸν θεὸν ἔν τε  
τῷ "Ὡς δὲ αὐτός εἰ (Ps. 107. 28)"· καὶ ἐν τῷ  
"οὐκ ἡχοίωμαι" (Ματ. 13. 6)"· ὅς δὲ τοῦ ἑπικουρίου θε-  
οῦ, σύνθετοι ἐξ ἀτόμων τυγχάνοντες καὶ τὸ ὅσον ἐπὶ τῇ  
συστάσει ἀναλντοί, πραγματεύονται τὰς φθοροποιούς  
ἀτόμους ἀποσείεσθαι. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ τῶν στωϊκῶν θεός, ἅ-  
τε σῶμα τυγχανῶν, ὅτε μὲν ἡγεμονικὸν ἔχει τὴν ὅλην  
οὐσίαν, ὅταν ἡ ἐκπύρωσις ᾖ· ὅτε δὲ ἐπὶ μέρος γί-  
νεται αὐτῆς, ὅταν ᾖ διακόσμησις. Οὐδὲ γὰρ δε-  
δύνηται οὗτοι τρανῶσαι τὴν ἐννοικίαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν-  
νοίαν ὡς πᾶντα ἀφθάρτου καὶ ἀωλοῦ καὶ ἀσυνδέτου  
καὶ ἀδιαιρέτου" 70

With regard to the second reason we must note that it is more related to the heretical movements of the fourth century, therefore ST. GREGORY devotes a lengthier analysis to this though at the end he links this with the former. So, GREGORY says that whereas the fear of a composition in the Trinity may entail a kind of Arianism, beginning from the substance and moving to the Hypostaseis might result in a loss of equilibrium; So he claims that if the person of the FATHER is accepted by all the parts, there is a "δέος",

« μὴ τὸν Πατέρα μὲν οὐσιώσωμεν, τὰλλα δὲ μὴ ὑποστή-  
σωμεν, ἀλλὰ δυνάμεις θεοῦ ποιήσωμεν ἐνυπαρχούσας, οὐχ ὁμοσιώσας » 71

This expression reflects ST. GREGORY'S opposition to Neoplatonism and pagan religion as well as to Sabellianism. Ancient Greek religion had been interpreted by later Neoplatonism and especially by JAMBLICHUS and we have a passage preserved by DAMASCIUS which gives the same witness about the "οὐσία" of the first god and the dependent hypostatization of the rest. Although this passage is concerned with the henads ("Ἐν ἁδες" ) as metaphysical entities we must pay particular attention to the notion of the derivation of the rest of the hypostaseis from the cardinal one. This

passage is of an essential significance for the point at issue, although E. R. DODDS is rather suspicious about its Jamblichian origin.<sup>72</sup> " Τοὺς θεοὺς οὕτως ὑποτίθενται τὸν πολλοὺς οἱ πρὸ Ἰαμβλίου σχεδὸν τι πάντες φιλόσοφοι, ἓνα μὲν εἶναι τὸν ὑπερουσίον θεὸν λέγοντες, τοὺς ἄλλους οὐσιώδεις εἶναι ταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἐλάμψεσιν ἐκθεομέρους, καὶ εἶναι τὸ τῶν ὑπερουσίων πληθος γενεάδων οὐκ αὐτοτεχῶν ὑποστάσεων, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐξαμφομένων ἀπὸ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ καὶ ταῖς οὐδαῖς ἐνδιδομένων θεώσεων ".<sup>73</sup>



In comparison with ST. GREGORY'S parallel passage it is note worthy to underline three points.

(a) The Philosophers' belief about god, who being beyond the substance ("ὑπερὸν σιός") and giving a hypostasis to his lower gods, presupposes clearly a subordination of hypostaseis which are not substance in themselves.

(b) The adjective "ὀνσιώδης" is used by both passages in the Platonic sense, and means 'reality',<sup>74</sup> as opposed to the unreal appearances of the perceptible world.

(c) Furthermore the usage of the adjective "ὀνσιώδης" with a noun in both cases creates an identical interpretative context; so in ST. GREGORY'S passage the phrase "καὶ ποιότητες ὀνσιώδης" is a parallel complement of the previous expression that the ray and the light are "ἡλιακαὶ τινες ἀπορροαί". This is a sheer neoplatonic articulation focusing on the derivation of the lower hypostaseis which follow in a strict series from the ultimate principle which is pure essence ("ὀνσιός"). Likewise in DAMASCIUS' passage the gods, who are after the "ὑπερὸν σιός" god, are "ὀνσιώδεις", and are made into gods by "ταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνός ἑχαμψέσιν". Of course the illuminations from the supra-essential god and the solar effluences and essential qualities presuppose the same kind of derivation and common point of reference, that is the great significance of the light ("φῶς") in the ancient world, in the Bible and in the tradition of the early Church. It is obvious from this analysis that ST. GREGORY knows the varied philosophical tendencies essentially and in depth and

for this reason he is able to distinguish the belief of the Church without breaking off the dialogue with Hellenism. Coming to a more minute examination of ST. GREGORY'S arguments, we first notice that the verbs "οὐσιῶ", "ὑφίστημι" and "ποιῶ" are used for the first entity, particularly in the active voice. On the other hand the form of the perfect participle "ὑφίστασθαι" of the verb "ὑφίσταμαι" denotes the mode of hypostatization of a concrete entity. The point is a hint against ancient Greek thought where everything, especially even the principles or the "ὄντως ὄντα", were subjected to logical articulation step by step; this was the main and inevitable requirement of philosophical inquiry, against which ST. GREGORY introduces an objective reality by the participle "ὑφίστασθαι",<sup>75</sup> which amounts to this: that only if we should have three simultaneous suns we might have accepted an "τρίῃ ἥλιος" image as "ὅντε γὰρ ἀκτὶς, ὅντε φῶς ἄλλος ἥλιος". According to ST. GREGORY (and according to ST. GREGORY PALAMAS in the fourteenth century) solar effluences ("ἡλιακαὶ τινες ἀπόρροιαί") and essential qualities ("ποιότητες οὐσιώδεις") are properties of the sun but not the sun itself. For this reason ST. GREGORY PALAMAS used this example to defend the uncreated character of the divine energies and powers as unmoved properties of the divine unknown essence.<sup>76</sup> Of course ST. GREGORY'S teaching on this is of a philosophical texture; his phraseology reminds us of PLATO'S and ARISTOTLE'S attempt to defend the first principles, the "ὄντως ὄντα" or "τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι". When, at a certain occasion ST. GREGORY talked about the most suitable Name

of God, he characterized his inquiry as a study of the "εἶναι" in itself (the Nature of Godhead). whereas now he says that this study cannot rely on illustrations deriving from the noetic or sensible realms.

Indeed "τὸ εἶναι" is considered to be the "οὐσία" or nature of God, whereas "τὰ μὴ (ὅντως) εἶναι" <sup>77</sup> are the "οὐσιώδεις ποιότητες" viz. the ray and light which the heretics use to speak of the Son and the Holy Spirit. This language is very close to that of PLOTINUS and his theory about the "οὐσία" (principle) which produces the lower hypostaseis which however are not "οὐσία" but preserve the properties or the essential characters of "οὐσία". Furthermore, as ST. GREGORY'S intention was to defend the homousion of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, he could not have accepted the image of the 'sun - ray - light' which especially after its use by APOLLINARIUS pointed to a Sabellian or Arian direction. He did however employ the image of Adam, Eve and Seth, in order to defend the divinity of the Holy Spirit, and the homousion of the Divine Hypostaseis. <sup>78</sup> In this image Adam is a type of the Father, Seth of the Son and Eve of the Holy Spirit. <sup>79</sup> ST. GREGORY'S thought consists of three main arguments,

- (a) The Holy Spirit is not a creature; <sup>80</sup>
- (b) He is not another Son, because He is not 'begotten';
- (c) He is God, homousios to Father and Son, just as Eve is homousios to Adam although she is derived from him. The

conclusion illustrates quite clearly ST. GREGORY'S purpose, which is the defence of the homoousion, "ὡμολογῆται οὖν καὶ τὰ διαφόρως ὑποστάιντα τῆς αὐτῆς εἶναι οὐσίας ἐνδέχεσθαι".<sup>81</sup> Thus ST. GREGORY does not produce an absolute argument by using the analogy of Adam and Eve and Seth is indicated by the usage of the verb "ἐνδέχεσθαι". He knows that the Spirit cannot be proved, but rather the Christian must always be led by Him.<sup>82</sup>

Although it is certain that ST. GREGORY is extremely cautious in his use of Trinitarian images, it is equally certain that from time to time and without being compelled by some particular necessity, he uses three trinitarian images, which he borrows from Greek thought: (a) the image of the trinitarian light; (b) that of the Cause - Maker - Perfector and (c) the psychological image of Mind - Logos - Spirit.

As we have already mentioned, the metaphor-image of light comes from the Greek tradition as well as from the biblical one, being essentially in an inner relation with fire, as light is considered to come from fire,<sup>83</sup> the "λεωτότατον"<sup>84</sup> of the four cosmological elements.<sup>85</sup> In the O.T. God is "πῦρ καταναλωτικόν".<sup>86</sup> In Orphism God is light and his name is Phanes ("φάνης" - "φῶς").<sup>87</sup> The Pythagorians included the contrast of Light - Darkness among the principal antitheses<sup>88</sup> of their dualistic conception of reality, on which later on PARMENIDES based his metaphysics of Light helping PLATO to formulate his myth about the cave in the sixth book of his Republic.<sup>89</sup> In the religious mysteries in Eleusis near Athens, light was identified with God, the vision of whom, (the "ἐκπνοία"), is accessible by his light.<sup>90</sup> ARISTOTLE uses the

image of light in his theory about knowledge as the active and passive mind.<sup>91</sup> But only with the Neoplatonists the Light symbolism obtains a central meaning in the ontological interpretation of the hypostatical participation, by the method of the effusion of Light.<sup>92</sup> Their ultimate purpose was to expound or to reinterpret the Platonic theory of participation ("μᾶθησις") or similarity, and the theory of difference or dissimilarity.<sup>93</sup> IN PLOTINUS light defines the relations between the three highest hypostaseis, everyone of which lies on its own appropriate level, as an effect in relation to a cause, but without the cause dismissing its ontological identity.<sup>94</sup> Thus the problem of essence ("οὐσία") and the participation in it, viz. the problem of unity and multiplicity ("ἓν" - "πολλα"), reaches its solution, as the simultaneous participation of the One and the many contains and transcends as well the ontological principle of contrast: "ταὐτόν" - "ἕτερον".<sup>95</sup> As D. K. KOUTRAS pointed out,<sup>96</sup> the ontological differentiation in the multiplicity of beings is not a result of the weakness of Light - One, but it is due to their natural inability to appropriate entirely the presence of Light, which remains in its entirety, an "ἐνέργεια οὐ βέουσα".<sup>97</sup> Thus the Light is an ontological principle and the power of Light which penetrates the lower hypostaseis as far as the phenomenal world and thus the philosophical dualism is interpreted. This latter is equal to the power of Darkness which does not possess a real hypostasis, as "μὴ οὐ" <sup>98</sup> or "παρὰ νοοτάσις". Only the Philosopher can become free from empirical associations through the illumination of truth, viz. the realm of being.<sup>99</sup>

In the biblical tradition God is the Maker of the natural light,<sup>100</sup> as well as being the origin of the spiritual one, and His name  $\text{יְהוָה}$  denotes one who shines.<sup>101</sup> The Fathers dealt with the Light in Christ's transfiguration.<sup>102</sup> Furthermore, the content of the Law is characterized as spiritual light,<sup>103</sup> and the same applies to the eschatological situation of the saints in blessedness.<sup>104</sup>

We may now turn to the examination of how ST. GREGORY harmonizes the Greek tradition with the biblical one in his trinitarian image of Light.

In a very important passage of the Oration on Holy Baptism, ST. GREGORY expounds his doctrine about the three Lights according to a scheme which reminds us of PLOTINUS' theory about the outflow of light and the graduation of the lower hypostaseis. According to ST. GREGORY God is the first Light,<sup>105</sup> the angels, the second, and the third one is man. It is note-worthy that the properties of the first Light, as " $\alpha\kappa\rho\acute{o}\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ " (highest), " $\alpha\pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\iota\tau\omicron\nu$ " (unapproachable), and " $\alpha\rho\rho\eta\tau\omicron\nu$ " (ineffable), are also the traditional Greek philosophical properties of the cardinal and ultimate principle, which is " $\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\ \nu\tilde{\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\chi\eta\tau\omicron\nu, \omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omega\ \rho\eta\tau\omicron\nu$ ".<sup>106</sup> The texture and wording of this passage is very similar to that one of the second theological oration, where ST. GREGORY refutes PLATO'S conception of God.<sup>107</sup> He says that " $(\theta\epsilon\omicron\nu)\ \phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \alpha\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\ldots$   
 $\nu\omicron\tilde{\eta}\sigma\alpha\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \alpha\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\omega}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ "; this is an exactly parallel wording to " $\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\ \nu\tilde{\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\eta\omega\tau\omicron\nu, \omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omega\ \rho\eta\tau\omicron\nu$ ", but in reverse order. The phrase " $\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \alpha\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ "



corresponds to " οὕτε λόγῳ ῥητόν" and the "νοῦσαί δὲ ἀδυνατώτερον" to " οὕτε νῶ̄ καταληπτόν", but in each case there is a different point of reference namely, God and Light. Although Light is incomprehensible and ineffable, it illuminates every reasoning creature.<sup>108</sup> The procedure is the same with that of PLATO and PLOTINUS; the soul is invited to follow its higher hypostaseis gradually in order to be illuminated by the noetic Light. ST. GREGORY, almost repeating PLATO'S relevant texts,<sup>109</sup> says " τοῦτο ἐν νοητοῖς (sc. God who is Light), ὅπερ ἐν αἰσθητοῖς ἥλιος· ὅσον ἂν καθαιρώμεθα, φανταζόμενον· καὶ ὅσον ἂν φαντασθῶμεν, ἀγαπῶμενον· καὶ ὅσον ἂν ἀγαπήσωμεν, αὐτοῖς νοουμένον".<sup>110</sup>

Of course we encounter here the Plotinian theme of the purification<sup>111</sup> and contemplation of the soul, which is governed by the love of mind.<sup>112</sup> The soul turning from the visible world to the noetic realities, binds itself to the mind, and in like manner the Christians who advance beyond purification reach the stage of being " θεοειδέστεροι",<sup>113</sup> from the rest. Man is by nature " θεοειδής", since he possesses the power of reasoning, by which he is the third Light after God and the angels, but ST. GREGORY also speaks about the first light of the visible creation, " ὡ̄ τὸ ἀρχέγονον ἡλὸς σκότος ἢ διεκδύα".<sup>114</sup>



At first sight it might have been said that in comparison with the Greek conception of light, especially when it is considered ontologically, ST. GREGORY'S doctrine appears to have an identical or at least parallel development, but a deeper study disproves this superficial judgement. What is of paramount significance is belief in the Holy Trinity in a concrete and biblical way, and to such an extent that everything is connected with the Mystery of Holy Economy, where God manifests Himself. Thus ST. GREGORY explains how he comprehends the use of the light-symbolism for God: " φῶς δὲ λέγω (sc. ST. GREGORY speaks of himself), τὸ ἐν Πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι θεωρούμενον· ὧν ὁλοντες ὅτινῃ συμφυΐα καὶ τὸ ἐν ἑξαρχα τῆς λαμπρότητος".<sup>115</sup>

In this elucidative passage two dogmatic points must be underlined

(a) That man experiences the divine Light by vision ( "θεωρεῖα" ) as it is contemplated ( "θεωρούμενον" ) in the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; this spiritual experience claims from the believer a gradual perfection, which makes him "θεοειδής";<sup>116</sup> (b) that the result of this vision is the acknowledgement that the Persons have unity of nature, viz. consubstantiality and a unique outpouring of their brightness, viz. unity of power and energy. It seems clear that ST. GREGORY uses the image of light to defend the homocousion since light, being the same in all its parts by nature, is more appropriate to express, so to speak, the consubstantiality. These points may be further elucidated by three other passages, where trinitarianism is more obvious, and at the same time the final goal is crystal clear. A presentation in juxtaposition of these three passages, will serve out understanding of ST. GREGORY'S trinitarian symbolism.

Passage I, Or. 40.41 P.G. 36, 417A-C " Ἐπὶ πᾶσι, καὶ πρὸ πάντων, φύλασέ μοι τὴν καχὴν παρακαταθήκην... τὴν εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱόν, καὶ ἁγίον Πνεῦμα, ὁμολογίαν... Τριῶν ἀπειρίων ἀπειρον συμφυΐαν, θεόν ἕνασ-τον καθ' ἑαυτὸ θεωρούμενον, ὡς Πατέρα καὶ Υἱόν, ὡς Υἱόν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, φύλασσομένης ἐκδόσεως τῆς ἰδιότητος. θεόν τὰ τρία σὺν ἀλλήλοις νοούμενα, ἑκείνο διὰ τὴν ὁμοουσιότητα, τοῦτο διὰ τὴν μοναρχίαν. οὐ φθάνω τὸ ἓν νοῆσαι, καὶ τοῖς τρισὶ περιλαμβάνομαι. οὐ φθάνω τὰ τρία διελθεῖν, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἓν ἀναφέρομαι. Ὄταν ἓν πὶ τῶν τριῶν φαντασθῶ, τοῦτο νομίζω τὸ πᾶν, καὶ τὴν ὄψιν πεπλήρωμαι, καὶ τὸ πλεῖον διέφηνεν. οὐκ ἔχω τὸ μέγεθος τούτου καταλαβεῖν, ἵνα δῶ τὸ πλεῖον τῷ λειπομένῳ. Ὄταν τὰ τρία συνέχω τῇ θεωρίᾳ, μίαν ὁρῶ λαμπράδα, οὐκ ἔχων διελεῖν ἢ μετρηῆσαι τὸ φῶς ἐνιζόμενον".

Passage II, Or. 39.11 P.G. 36, 345CD " θεοῦ δὲ ὅταν εἴπω, ἐνὶ φωτὶ περιασ-τράφνητε καὶ τρισὶ· τρισὶ μὲν κατὰ τὰς ἰδιότητας, εἴτουν ὑποστάσεις... εἴτε πρόσωπα<sup>117</sup>... ἐνὶ δὲ κατὰ τὸν τῆς οὐσίας λόγον, εἴτουν θεότητος. Διαίρεται γὰρ ἀδιαίρετως... καὶ συνάπτεται διηρημένως. Ἐν γὰρ ἓν τρισὶν ἢ θεότης, καὶ τὰ τρία ἓν τὰ ἐν οἷς ἡ θεότης, ἢ τό γε ἀκριβέστερον εἰπεῖν, ἢ ἡ θεότης".

Passage III, Or. 31.14 P.G. 36, 148D-149A "c0. δὲ κοινὸς ἡμῶν  
 πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους τίς ἀγὼν τε καὶ λόγος; Ἡμῶν εἰς ὁ θεός, ὅτι  
 μία θεότης καὶ πρὸς ἓν τὰ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀναφορὰν ἔχει, καὶ  
 τρία πιστεύηται. οὐ γάρ, τὸ μὲν μακρόν, τὸ δὲ ἥττον  
 θεός· οὐδὲ τὸ μὲν πρότερον, τὸ δὲ ἕστερον· οὐδὲ βουλήσει  
 τέμνεται, οὐδὲ δυνάμει μερίζεται, οὐδέ τι τῶν ὅσα τοῖς μεριστοῖς  
 ὑπάρχει, καὶ ταῦθα λαβεῖν ἔστιν· ἀλλὰ ἀμέριστος ἐν μεμερισμέ-  
 νοις, εἰ δὲ συντόμως εἰπεῖν, ἡ θεότης καὶ ὅσον ἐν ἡλίοις τρισὶν ἔχο-  
 μένοις ἀκτῶν, μία τοῦ φωτός σύγκρασις. ὅταν μὲν οὖν πρὸς  
 τὴν θεότητα βλέπωμεν, καὶ τὴν πρῶτην αἴτλαν, καὶ τὴν μονα-  
 χίαν, ἐν ἡμῶν τὸ φανταζόμενον· ὅταν δὲ πρὸς τὰ ἐν οἷς ἡ  
 θεότης, καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς πρῆτης αἴτλας ἀκρόνως ἐκείθεν ὄντα  
 καὶ ὁμοδόξως, τρία τὰ προσκυνοῦμενα" 118.

First of all it must be noted (a) that the three passages show  
 unity in their use of the trinitarian images of the torch  
 (in pass. I),<sup>119</sup> pure light (pass. II)<sup>120</sup> and sun (pass. III);  
 (b) that the light-symbolism is the original image from which  
 the other two derive, since according to ST. GREGORY'S cosmology,  
 matter (ὕλη) follows ontologically the species,<sup>121</sup> and (c) that  
 the ultimate goal of using the threefold image of Light is the  
 defence of the homousion vis-à-vis the heretical attacks. The  
homousion is the greatest point of ST. GREGORY'S trinitarian  
 doctrine, and of course it forms the background to each of the  
 above quoted passages. To be precise, in passage I there is

an explicit hint against Arianism, Sabellianism and Pneumatomachianism, in the statement that the baptised must confess faith in our Godhead, who is " οὐτε ἀνώμαλον οὐσίαις ἢ φύσεσιν" , a thing that Arius taught, " οὐτε ἀβυσσοειδήν καὶ ἀνομήνην καὶ μείουμένην ὑπερβολαῖς καὶ ὑφέσεσι" , which is Sabellius's doctrine of "πλατυσμός" and "πάντοθεν ἴσιν, τὴν αὐτὴν πάντοθεν" , a belief which <sup>the</sup> Pneumatomachians refused. On the other hand the conclusion of passage II is indicative of the condemnation of Arius' and Sabellius' heresies,<sup>122</sup> who are explicitly mentioned: " Ἀπέστω γὰρ ἡμῶν ἕξ ἰσού καὶ ἡ Σάβελλου συναίρεσις καὶ ἡ Ἀρείου διαίρεσις, τὰ ἐν διαμέτρῳ κακὰ καὶ ἁμαρτία τὴν ἀσφάλειαν".<sup>123</sup> whereas passage III begins apologetically, by stressing that the orthodox theologian has to argue against both heresies together.<sup>124</sup>

We touched on ST. GREGORY'S specific purpose in some detail in order to stress the necessity which produced the use of the image of 'light' and which might be characterized as paedagogical and apologetic; we find that ST. GREGORY theologizes only in order to define what is heresy, i.e. what is not Orthodoxy, and that he restrains himself from giving an abstract definition of what orthodoxy is. On this latter, he is satisfied to declare only his belief in God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, preserving thus the immediacy of the biblical tradition. A point of departure for understanding intimately the use of the light-image is the well known bipolar scheme: " Μονὰς ὁ Ὑπέρτατος" and vice versa<sup>125</sup> whereby the homoousion and the monarchy remain the safeguard for the Orthodox belief, " Ἐκεῖνο διὰ τὴν ὁμοουσιότητα, τοῦτο διὰ τὴν μοναρχίαν".<sup>126</sup> This is affirmed.

in contrast to the exaggerated emphasis which is placed upon only one part of this schema by the extremists of the heretical sects. Thus, the monarchy and the trinitarian consubstantiality of the Holy Trinity are illustrated, so to speak, under the image-light, as it is obvious from the underlined words of the following extracts:

Passage I:

"Ὁὗ φθάνω τὸ ἐν νοῦσαι καὶ τοῖς τρισὶ περι-  
λαμπομαι· οὗ φθάνω τὰ τρία διεχεῖν, καὶ εἰς  
τὸ ἐν ἀναφέρομαι... "Ὅταν τὰ τρία συνέχω τῇ θεω-  
ρίᾳ, μίαν ὁρῶ λαμπάδα, οὐκ ἔχων διεχεῖν ἢ μετρήσαι  
τὸ φῶς ἐνιζόμενον."

Passage II:

"θεοῦ δὲ ὅταν εἴπω, ἐνὶ φωτὶ περιαστράφητε καὶ  
τρισὶ... Διαιρεῖται γάρ. ἀδιαίρετως,... καὶ συνάπτε-  
ται διηρημένως".

Passage III:

"Ἀλλὰ ἀμέριστος ἐν μεμερισμένοις... ἡ θεότης·  
καὶ ὅσον ἐν ἡλίοις τρισὶν ἔχομένοις ἀκτῶν, μία  
τοῦ φωτός σύγκρισις"

While insisting imperatively on the analysis of the particular terms and their meaning, which were produced during the theological controversies, we must say that, in the above mentioned extracts, the terms "διαιρεῖται" καὶ "συνάπτεται", as well as their synonyms, denote the two heresies of Arianism and Sabellianism. On the other hand, the Orthodox refutation of these heretical extremes are

presented under the following paradoxical schematizations:

"Τὰ τρία διελεῖν" — "εἰς τὸ ἓν ἀναφέρομαι"  
 "Τὰ τρία συνέλω" — "τὸ φῶς ἐνιζόμενον"  
 "Τρισὶ (sc. φωσὶ) περιστράφητε" — "ἐνὶ φωτὶ περιστράφητε"  
 "διαρεῖται ἀδιαίρετως" — "συνάπτεται διηρημένως"  
 "ἐν ἡχοῖς τρισὶν ἔχομένοις" — "μία τοῦ φωτός σύγκρασις"

which end with the stereotyped tenet: "ἀμέριστος ἐν μεμερισμένοις

ἡ θεότης"

(The undivided Godhead is in each divided Person

entire.)<sup>127</sup>

In these symbolic images of a simultaneous conception

of three torches and one ("λαμπάς"), three lights and one ("φῶς"),

three suns and one ("ἥλιος"), the paradoxical type of "Μονὰς ἐν

Τριάδι-Τριάς ἐν Μονάδι" recurs also with created images

(as those of torch, light and sun) and shows the impossibility of

the created world to illustrate the essence and the relations of the

Three Hypostaseis. At last, beyond the limits of creation, man is

the first creature who has been invited by God himself through an

act of perfect and absolute love, (viz. that of the incarnation) to

break the ontological bonds of limit and darkness and to rest on the

infinite abyss of the Divine Light. Then:

Ὁ θεὸς, ὃς καθ'αυτὸ νόου μετὰ λησιν ἔρωαῖς

οὐρανίων φάεων δέρεται ἀγλαίην"<sup>128</sup>

Although ST. GREGORY uses the trinitarian image of Light,

referring simultaneously to three and one Lights, against a one-sided

illustration of ARIUS or SABELLIUS, we must note however that this

image is more appropriate to SABELLIUS' heresy than ARIUS' since



by its nature the light is indicative of profound unity. This also applies to the Plotinian conception of light, which penetrates every lower hypostasis without changing its essence. ST. GREGORY acquired clear insight into this danger when he expounded I Cor. XV, 28 "ἔσται δὲ ὁ θεὸς τὰ πάντα ἐν πασίν", and dealt with the proper relation between orthodox theology and its soteriological presuppositions. The passage is of an eschatological content

"Ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς ἀποστασάσεως· οὐχ ὁ πατήρ, πάντως εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναχθέντος τοῦ νοῦ, ὥστε εἰς πύραν μεγάλην λαμπάδος πρὸς καιρὸν ἀποσπασθείσης, (it would entail Arianism), εἶτα συναφθείσης,

(the final result surely leads to Sabellianism), μηδὲ γὰρ λαβή-  
χιοι. τῷ ῥητῷ τούτῳ παρὰ φθειρέσθωσαν, ἀλλ' ὅλος θεός, ὅταν μνηέτι ποτὶ ἡμῶν, ὥστε τῶν τοῖς κινήμασι καὶ τοῖς πάθεσιν, οὐδὲν ὅλως θεοῦ, ἢ ὀλίγον ἐν ἡμῶν αὐτοῖς φέροντες, ἀλλ' ὅλοι θεοειδῆς, ὅλου θεοῦ χωρητικοὶ καὶ μόνον· τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ τελείωσις, πρὸς ἣν σπεύδομεν" 129

ST. GREGORY is most explicit in the fifth of his theological orations:

φῶς, καὶ φῶς, καὶ φῶς, ἀλλ' ἐν φῶς, εἷς θεός" 130

Returning to a passage which has already been analysed in Chapter IV<sup>131</sup> of this treatise, and in which God and creation are spoken of in terms of Mastery and Service, we may clarify yet further our present outlook.<sup>132</sup> In this passage God is called

"αἴτιος" (cause), "δημιουργός" (creator), and "τελειοποιός" (Perfector), in the sense that "τῷ πατρὶ λέγω" (sc. ST.

GREGORY speaks of himself), καὶ τῷ νύμφῃ καὶ τῷ

ἁγίῳ πνεύματι".<sup>133</sup> It is clear that although by the names



Cause, Creator and Perfector the function of each Divine Person in the Mystery of the Holy Dispensation is confessed, the energy ( "ἐνέργεια" ) of the Holy Trinity is undivided.<sup>134</sup> Here again we must underline the biblical character of ST. GREGORY'S theology which adheres to a strict ecclesiastical goal.

Compared to the use of this illustration by the Greek Philosophers, that of ST. GREGORY is kept within the Christian perspectives:

"ἔνδον τῶν ἡμετέρων ὄρων" . This is why having referred to the biblical explanation of the illustration: Cause - Creator - Perfector, ST. GREGORY criticizes the majority of his contemporary heresies, viz. those of Arius and Sabellius.<sup>135</sup> On the other hand we must discern in the Greek tradition an abstract articulation of the Presence of God in such a way that His energies have usurped his being. For example in Orphic Poetry, as well as in the Oracula Chaldaica, the previous illustration occurs in an almost similar fashion, as it is obvious from some Fragments, some of which may be quoted below:

Frag. Orph. 33 (ABEL p.157) - PLATO, Legg. IV 715D "ὁ μὲν δὲ θεός, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ παλαιός λόγος, ἀρχὴν τε καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μέσα τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων ἔχων εὐθείᾳ περιαίνει κατὰ γένον περιπορευόμενος" of Schol. ad. h. l. apud Bekkerum III 2 p.451 (ABEL p.157): "θεὸν μὲν τὸν δημιουργὸν σαφῶς, παλαιὸν δὲ λόγον λέγει τὸν Ὀρφεϊκόν, ὅς ἐστιν οὗτος. Ζεὺς ἀρχή, Ζεὺς μέσα, Διὸς δ' ἐν πάντα τέτυκται. Ζεὺς πνυθμὴν γαίης τε καὶ οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος. Καὶ ἀρχὴ μὲν οὗτος ὡς ποιητικὸν αἴτιον, τελευτὴ δὲ ὡς τελικόν, μέσα δὲ ὡς ἑξ ἴσου πᾶσι παρῶν, καὶ πάντα διαφόρως αὐτοῦ μετέχει" 136

ORACULA CHALDAICA, PROCIUS, Theol. Plat., 365, 1

"τὸ μὲν γὰρ πατρικὸν ἀρχηγικὸν ἔστι πανταχοῦ, τοῦ μέσου δὲ ἡ δύναμις, ἡ δὲ νοῦς τὸ τέχος συμπεριλαμβάνει τῆς Τριάδος· ἡ μὲν γὰρ δύναμις σὺν ἐκείνῳ, νοῦς δ' ἀπ' ἐκείνου, κατὰ τὸ λόγιον".

ORACULA CHALDAICA, DAMASCIUS, I 108, 17 (RUELLE)

"Ἀλλ' ὥς οἱ θεοὶ καὶ αὐτοὶ μέντοι ἀνθρώποις διαλεγόμενοι οὕτως ἔχειν πρὸς ἀλλήλοισι ἀπεφάναντο τὰς τρεῖς ἀρχάς, ὥς ἂν ἔχει νοῦς καὶ δύναμις καὶ πατὴρ ἢ ὑπαρξίς καὶ δύναμις τῆς ὑπαρξεως καὶ νόησις τῆς δυνάμεως" 137

It is obvious that the third part in the Greek Triad is called "τέχος" [as in ST. GREGORY "τελειοποιός"],<sup>138</sup> "νοῦς" and "νόησις τῆς δυνάμεως" an expression which defines the ontological relation between the second hypostasis [in ST. GREGORY it is the "Δημιουργός", who of course manifests Himself by the "δύναμις"] and the third one. The fact that ST. GREGORY is aware of the sense of "νοῦς" as applied by the Greeks to the third hypostasis, seems quite amazing. In paragraph v of the fifth theol. oration where ST. GREGORY refutes the belief about the Holy Spirit of some Jewish sects, as well as that of some Pagans, he says that "Ἑλλήνων δὲ οἱ θεολογικώτεροι, καὶ μᾶλλον ἡμῶν προσεγγίσαντες, ἐφάντασθησαν, ὥς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ· περὶ δὲ τὴν κλησιν διηνέχθησαν νοῦν τοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸν θύραθεν νοῦν, καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα προσαγορεύσαντες" 139

This passage is very important since it bears witness to ST. GREGORY'S opinion of the true achievements of Greek religion and thought. He seems to be following at this point the APOLOGISTS' line who discerned elements of true theology even in the Pagan world, appreciating the fact that man preserved his divine character after the original sin. I think that this is the reason that ST. GREGORY, without taking a negative position against the Greek tradition, criticizes successfully its failure to save man from his vicious circle. According to the commentators, ancient and modern alike, the "θεολογικώτεροι" of the Greeks are Plato and Aristotle, although A. J. MASON<sup>140</sup> notes precisely probably following ELIAS,<sup>141</sup> that the expression "νοῦς τοῦ παντός" occurs in some of the Neoplatonists. It is apparent from the above mentioned passage that the origin of this expression without doubt belongs to Orphic Poetry as it was formulated throughout the whole Greek tradition and especially in the Corpus Hermeticum, the Oracula Chaldaica and the Scholia of the Neoplatonists. It would be beyond the purpose of this treatise to try to find out the extent to which the Greek pagan philosophers have been influenced by the Christian Fathers.

Similar to the previous illustration of Cause - Creator - Perfector is that which characterises God by the context of his function within the Divine Economy and particularly the divine elements of the human being, viz. the illustration of Mind - Logos - Spirit which occurs in ST. GREGORY'S works only twice.<sup>142</sup> In this the Father is a type of the Mind ("Νοῦς"), the Son of Logos ("Λόγος") and the Holy Spirit ("Πνεῦμα"). This illustration

comes from DIDYMUS<sup>143</sup> and is based upon the philosophical conception that Mind is his power or energy and their results coincide absolutely.<sup>144</sup> In dealing with this illustration ST. GREGORY stresses once again the impossibility of any image being able to express the Truth, and he ends with a definition of the Christian life which entails the profound knowledge of an ontological distinction between Mastery and Service and according to which man must "μὴ φύρειν τὰ δεισιπῶτα, νοῦ ταπεινότητι".<sup>145</sup> Through his Holy Economy God chose man to make him the greatest witness of this manifestation, leaving His imprint on his Creation, even after man's fall. On this basis there is a unity in the history of man either the biblical or extra-biblical one, and for this reason the Son "εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθε".

The words of ST. JOHN DAMASCENUS, the great Theologian of the Icons, may be recalled as an apt conclusion to this section: "Φησὶ γοῦν καὶ ὁ θεορρήμων Γρηγόριος, ὅτι πολλὰ κάμνων ὁ νοῦς ἐκβῆναι τὰ σωματικά, πάντῃ ἀδυνατεῖ. ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθοράται. Ὁρώμεν γὰρ εἰκόνας ἐν τοῖς κτίσμασι μνηνούσας ἡμῖν ἀμυδρῶς τὰς θείας ἐμφάνσεις. ὥς ὅτε λέγομεν τὴν ἁγίαν Τριάδα, τὴν ὑπεράρχιον, εἰκονίζεσθαι δι' ἡλίου, καὶ φωτός, καὶ αὐτῆτος· ἢ πηγῆς ἀναβλυσούσης, καὶ πηγασομένου γάματος, καὶ ἀροχῆς· ἢ νοῦ καὶ λόγου, καὶ πνεύματος τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς".<sup>146</sup>

## CONCLUSION

Insistence on <sup>the</sup> original texts, maintenance of an old fashion terminology, appreciation of the scholiasts of the ancient Church particularly, and examination of grammatical particularities, keep this treatise methodologically close to ST. GREGORY'S lines, comparing in general "πατερικῶς τὰ πατερικά".

At the very beginning we tried to touch on some points of ST. GREGORY'S education, in order to indicate why he was sensitive in the precise usage of the achievements of the philosophical thought and its misuse by the heretics and his contemporary pagans. After a long time of education at the most significant centres of the ancient world he was able to appreciate the weak points of the abstract articulation of the Philosophical principles, as well as to perceive the <sup>true</sup> position of

Greek thought within the universal Economy of man's salvation. Following the Apologists' view about the relation between Jewish and Greek culture he interprets optimistically the period after the Fall and the darkening of the divine image by Adam and Eve; Greek Philosophers were Moses' pupils: "Ἀπὸς τοῖς τοῦ ἀνδρός πεπειραμένοις ὁ Μίνως ἑκεῖνος, καὶ ὁ Ῥαδάμανθυς, οὓς ἀσφοδεῶν λειμώνων καὶ ἡλυσίων πεδίων ἠξίωσαν ἔλθινες, ἔν γανταστὰ τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς παραδείσου γερόμενοι, ἐκ τῶν Μωσαϊκῶν, οἶμαι θιβλίων καὶ ἡμετέρων, εἰ καὶ περὶ τὴν ἀληθειάν τι διηγήσασθαι ἐνάχρως ὀνόμασι τούτου παραδεδωχέντες". (Or. 43.23 P.G. 36, 528BC.)

On the other hand his steady orientation towards the orthodox confession of the Trinitarian dogma justifies his disappointments when he

sees his fellow-churchmen trying to conciliate essentially different dogmatic views, or deliberately refusing to confess their orthodox belief openly. Thus his retreats and flights from the active life and the enthusiastic praise of the life of "philosophical" theoria, which is <sup>not</sup> theoria of the glory of the Holy Trinity, may be appropriately assessed.

Furthermore his theological presuppositions define the framework according to which the theologian, being the spiritual leader of the Christians, must theologize without running the risk of becoming a heretic. Like the Greek Philosophers ST. GREGORY organizes his thought following a logical methodology which claims from the Christian devotion to the spiritual order and obedience to the ecclesiastical tradition. Thus ST. GREGORY defines the orthodox spirituality as life of three stages; purification, inactivity and finally theoria constitutes the life of the Theologian par excellence.

The O.T. and the N.T., as well as the Ecclesiastical tradition, (the vision and experiences of Saints, viz. the Continuous Pentecost within the Church), are the sources of the dogmatic doctrine. In the last analysis the dogma is for ST. GREGORY a matter of life, and should in no way be reduced to an abstract system as it happens with the philosopher who may separate <sup>the</sup> logical or mystical achievements of his thought from his style of life.

Responsibility, measure and symmetry characterize the orthodox declaration of the Trinitarian dogma, that is the Via Media in contrast to the heretical views which always move to extremes.



Only the perfect theologian may speak of the Trinitarian dogma, viz. theologia, whereas the rest of the Christians in proportion to their spiritual stage are able to discuss about the Holy Dispensation, the core of which is the incarnation of the Son. "θεολογία" and "ὁρκονομία" thereby are two terms of ontological and soteriological dimensions. In terms of this distinction ST. GREGORY paves the way for the sacerdotal character of Byzantine theology, according to which the priests and especially the bishops are responsible for the orthodox teaching of the Christians.

ST. GREGORY is of a positive opinion about Greek education and acknowledges the positive elements in the methodology and training of ancient philosophy, but he disagrees entirely with the purpose of the pagan education and especially with the theurgic tendency of the latest Neoplatonism, which became the philosophical and cosmological interpretation of the ancient religion. For ST. GREGORY the true philosopher is the Christian theologian, who after certain and painful preparation, reaches such a level of objectivity, that he becomes a voice of the Holy Spirit. Eventually this is the objective claim of the orthodox dogma against the mutability of the subjective character of the 'existentialist' individuality of heretics. Hence, in no way should ST. GREGORY be seen as a forerunner of modern existentialism (individualism), an idea which recently has been connected with his name by a number of contemporary interpreters in the East.

In the same framework of theological objectivity ST. GREGORY examines the Divine Names. Every name expresses something about the essence of things. This is based upon the idea that human reason is



the means for objective inquiry into the unchangeable reality. For the Greek Philosophers no name expresses the divine entity, because of the strictly subordinational structure of their ontological system and the articulation of the divine Hypostaseis, but for ST. GREGORY and the Fathers in general this ineffability of being is based on the ontological difference between the Creator and creation. Nevertheless he does link name and being because the condensation of God in His Revelation before and after the Incarnation; the O.T. and the N.T. and especially the experience of Pentecost bear witness to the presence of God, which is the ground of true knowledge and speech.

ST. GREGORY classifies the Divine Names into (a) Names proper to Essence, as the "ὢν", "θεός", "Κύριος", and (b) Common Names of the divine Authority and of the Dispensation. This latter category introduces the Triplicity of the Persons within the Godhead, whereas the former states its unity. The issue about the Divine Names is very important for the Trinitarian dogma and especially the defence of the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, since by alternating application of these names to the three Persons of the Holy Trinity the equality in honour and the consubstantiality of Each of them are safeguarded. Within this theological setting the Divine Names, which at least manifest only the divine energy of the Holy Trinity who works out man's salvation through the Dispensation, reflect the soteriological presuppositions, being thus of a trinitarian character. God is Living, His Names are Living, His Logos is Living, man's salvation is real. The Presence of the Holy Trinity penetrates the Universe and man's life; man may correspond to his Archetypon in Christ, Who is his image.

From the point of view of the achievements of human reason, in the context of man's post lapsarian condition, Greek thought provides a kind of monotheism which had been arrived at by means of the innate reason. ST. GREGORY is particularly aware of Greek monotheism, either that of the Philosophers or of the theurgical religion; but he calls it polytheia because of its abstract notion of Oneness for the multiplicity of gods. Instead of the abstract essence of the Philosophers and their theory of subordination of the divine Hypostaseis, a theory which leads towards the coeternity of the ultimate principle with creation, ST. GREGORY introduces the paradoxical schema "Τριάς Ἐν Μο-  
νᾷδι" and vice versa, and in so doing he excludes a non-hypostatized essence or three non-substantial Hypostaseis. This explains further why the Holy Trinity is beyond the categories of space and time, viz. beyond the categories of the "γένεσις" and "φθορά", or of an ontological motion. So that which seems to be motion within the Holy Trinity actually is only the condescending and economic manifestation of the Persons throughout the Holy Dispensation undertaken for the sake of man's salvation; this consists of the particular function of the Persons of the Holy Trinity, which leads man to the true "θεογνωσία", the Trinitarian Knowledge.

In the Trinitarian doctrine ST. GREGORY follows ST. ATHANASIUS, whom he admires more than any other among the earlier Fathers and theologians, and he may be placed among the so called Cappadocian Fathers together with ST. BASIL and ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA. He shares with them the main characteristics of the Cappadocian Trinitarian doctrine concerning the matter of Unity and Triplicity of the Holy Trinity,

the economic manifestation and function of Each of the Persons which entails the simultaneous presence of the other Two without confusion or coalescence, since they possess the same will, power, energy and glory.

The personality of each Hypostasis is unchangable and the alteration of the prepositions "ἐξ οὗ", "δι' οὗ", "ἐν ᾧ" - which were used by the Greek Philosophers alike, in order to explain the ontological subordination - as well as the reverse of the order of the names of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit states the divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit in contrast to ARIUS' and SABELLIUS' heresy.

The basis of union concerning the Son and the Holy Spirit is the Hypostasis of the Father, who is the origin and cause of Both, although ST. GREGORY corrects ST. BASIL on this point, making the essence of the Godhead the ultimate ground of this truth. So he uses the homousion to safeguard and to confess the unity of the Three Hypostaseis and to declare unambiguously the divinity of the Holy Spirit, Whom he clearly calls "θεός". This statement is ST. GREGORY'S personal contribution to the formulation of the Trinitarian dogma.

Although the Fathers of the Second Ecumenical Council, following rather conservative and in some way moderate lines, as those of ST. BASIL'S "θεολογικὴ οἰκονομία", with respect to <sup>the</sup> Holy Spirit, after the Fourth Ecumenical Council ST. GREGORY'S explicit doctrine became the rule of orthodoxy and it was incorporated into the dogmatic doctrine of the Eastern Church.

The starting-point of ST. GREGORY'S argumentation was always the dogmatic difference between the doctrine of his opponent and that one which he believed to be the orthodox doctrine of the Church. He was not under the illusion that final agreement could only be reached on the basis of similarities. Similarities were the basis for dialogue but the main purpose of the theological debates in the Patristic period was to underline the particular points in which the heretics failed to conform with the ecclesiastical tradition.

On this last premise ST. GREGORY tackles the question of the Trinitarian images which the heretics used in order to explain away <sup>means of</sup> by logical devices the "Παραδόξος" character of the theologia and especially the doctrine about the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation. Although he is reluctant to apply images borrowed from the Created World to the theologia of the Holy Trinity he does do so in a moderate and qualified way in order to expose and refute the heretical positions.

Having personal experience and theoria of the Living God, ST. GREGORY is openly and to some extent positively disposed towards the whole Dispensation, as everyone who lives in the continuous Pentecost of the Church, "ὅτι εἰσὶ τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐστῶτων οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γένησονται θανάτου ἕως ἂν ἴδωσι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ" (Matth. 16.28.).

# INTRODUCTION

## NOTES

1. W. BARCLAY, Educational ideals in the ancient world, London 1959, p. 132.
2. H. I. MARROU, A history of education in antiquity (trans), New York 1956, p. 425.
3. JULIANUS, Epist. et Leg. 61 De professoribus, ed. I. BIDEZ-F. CUMONT (BUDE), Paris-London 1922, pp. 69-75. cf. C. MORESCHINI, L'opera e la personalita dell' imperatore Giuliano nelle due "inuectivae" di Gregorio Nazianzeno, In FORMA FUTURI, Festschrift, M. PELLEGRINO, Torino 1975, pp. 416-430.
4. ORIG. De princ. IV. 26. P.G. 11,399B
5. Saint Gregoire de Nazianze, Theologien, Paris 1951, p. 33.
6. R. R. RUTHER, Gregory of Nazianzus, Oxford 1969, pp. 1-17.
7. A. H. M. JONES, "The social background of the struggle between Paganism and Christianity", In The conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the fourth century, ed. A. MOMIGLIANO, Oxford 1963, p. 28.
8. cf. PHILOSTR. Vitae Sophistarum (A. WESTERMANN) Parisiis 1859, p. 196 "Τὴν ἀρχαίαν σοφιστικὴν ῥητορικὴν ἡγετοῦναι χρὴ φιλοσοφοῦσαν... ἡ μὲν δὲ ἀρχαία σοφιστικὴ καὶ τὰ φιλοσοφούμενα ὑποτακμένα διέχεσθαι ἀποσπόμενα καὶ εἰς μὴ-ΚΟΣ". cf. also SYNESEIUS, Dio vel de ipsius vitae instituto, P.G.66, 1112C-1164A.
9. ORIG. De Princ. 33 P.G.11, 315AB.
10. See an excellent H. ZUMPT'S treatise "Über den Bestand der Philosophischen Schulen in Athen und die Succession der Scholarchen" in Abhandlungen der Königlischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1844, pp. 27-119, and L. PETIT DE JULLEVILLE, L'ecole d'Athenes au IVe siecle apres Jesus-Christ, Paris 1868; also B. N. TATAKES, Ἡ συμβολὴ τῆς Καππαδοκίας στὴ χριστιανικὴ ἀκρόαση, Athens 1960, pp. 27-37.
11. cf. T. A. KOPECEK, "The social class of the Cappadocian Fathers" in CH, 42 (1973) pp. 453-466 and by the same "The Cappadocian Fathers and civic Patriotism", in CH 43 (1974) pp. 293-303.

12. A. H. M. JONES, op. cit., p. 26.
13. For the dates and details of his life see P. GALLAY, La vie de Saint Grégoire de Nazianze, Paris 1943, and A. PUECH, Histoire de la littérature Grecque Chrétienne, tom. 3, pp. 318-395, Paris 1930, C. ULLMAN, Gregory of Nazianzus (trans.), London 1851.
14. Or. 43.13 P.G. 36, 512A.
15. Ib. 14, 513A.
16. Or. 7.6 P.G. 35, 701A "Εγὼ μὲν τοῖς κατὰ Παλαιστίνην ἔχματα-  
μείνας παιδευτηρίοις, ἀνδρῶσι τότε κατὰ ῥητορικῆς ἔρωτα".
17. HIERONYM. De Viris Illustr., 117 "Euzoius apud  
Thespesium rhetorem, cum Gregorio Nazianzeno episcopo,  
adolescens Caesareae eruditus est".
18. H. I. MARROU, op. cit., p. 437, alleges that in Alexandria  
the actual teaching from the third century to the fourth was  
a distinct retrogression and the lessons were private.
19. Or. 43 P.G. 36, 483A-605A.
20. Or. 43. 15 P.G. 36, 513D.
21. Ib. P.G. 36, 516AB.
22. LUCIAN, Eun. 2-3.
23. Or. 43. 17 P.G. 36, 517B sq.
24. Vitae Soph. (J. FR. BOISSONADE), p. 493  
cf. also SOZOM. Ecc. Hist. 6, 17 P.G. 67, 7333C.
25. Epit. 5 P.G. 38, 13 vers. 6-7.
26. Or. 43. 21 P.G. 36, 524C. "Βλαβεραὶ μὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἀθῆναι,  
τὰ εἰς ψυχὴν... καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ πλουτοῦσι τὸν κακὸν πλοῦτον,  
ἐβόλα, μᾶλλον τῆς ἄλλης Ἑλλάδος".
27. Or. 43. 11 P.G. 36, 508C.
28. Ib. 509A. cf. also Or. 21. 32 P.G. 35, 1120D "Ἀεὶ τοῦ κενου-  
μένου χριστιανῶν ἀνασκλητρον μένου, διὰ τῆς ἑλλη-  
νικῆς προσθήκης καὶ τῆς ἐκείνου συνέσεως, ὅ καὶ παράδοξον".
29. Ib. 509A.



30. Vitae Sophistarum, lib. I.i, p. 196
31. Ib. p. 197, and Ib. p. 195.
32. Or. 43. 93 P.G. 36, 528A. "Τίς δὲ γραμματικὴν ἢ γλῶσσαν ἐξελέ-  
νξει, καὶ ἱστορίαν συνάξει, καὶ μέτροις ἐπιτάτῃ, καὶ νομο-  
θετεῖ ποιήμασιν".
33. Or. 22. 3 P.G. 35, 7453C. "καὶ τὴν ποχνύμνητον δὲ ταύτην  
σοφιστικὴν, ἢ γραμματικὴν, ἵνα μὴ λέγω φιλοσοφίαν".
34. Vitae philos. et sophist., p. 487.
35. Or. 5. 23 P.G. 35, 692AB. "Διττός δὲ αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐπιδημίας  
ὁ λόγος· ὁ μὲν εὐπρεπέστερος, καθ' ἱστορίαν τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ τῶν ἐκείσε  
παιδευτῶν· ὁ δὲ ἀπορρητότερος, καὶ ὁ πολλοῖς γνώριμος, ὥστε  
τοῖς ἐκεί θύταις καὶ ἀπατεῶσι περὶ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν συγ-  
γενέσθαι".  
cf. E. R. DODDS,  
Theurgy and its relationship to Neoplatonism, In JRS, 37 (1947),  
pp. 55-69.
36. Or. 43. 24 P.G. 36, 529AB.
37. PHILOSTRATUS, Vitae sophistarum, 2.2, p. 235-236.
38. Ib. cf. EUNAPIUS, Vitae Sophistarum p. 493 (J. FR. BOISSONADE )  
says that PROAERESIOS tried to obtain the chair of sophistry and  
that another candidate, MOUSSONIOS, gave up when he knew that  
PROAERESIOS set up a claim to the chair of sophistry, "καταμαθὼν  
πρὸς τίνα ἔχει τὸν ἀγῶνα, ταχὺ μάλα ἐπὶ τὸν πολιτικὸν  
κατενήδησεν".
39. cf. SVETONIUS, Vies des douze Césars, lib. 7, 18, ed. BUDE,  
vol. 3, Paris 1932, and CAPIT. Histor. Script. August., 21C.
40. We have one case in which the holders of the philosophical  
chairs in Athens elected the candidate of the chair of sophistry,  
PHILOST. Vitae soph. lib. 2.2, p. 235-236 ( J. FR. BOISSONADE )  
and EUNAPIUS testimony that LIBANIUS disliked to be called  
rhetor " φήσας τὸν σοφιστὴν εἶναι μέζονα ". Vita Sophista-  
rum p. 496 ( J. FR. BOISSONADE ),
41. Vita S. Gregorii theologi, P.G. 35, 257B, cf. SOCR. Hist. Eccl.  
26 P.G. 67. 529A. " Ἀλλοί τε τοῦ σοφιστεῦν κριθέντες, ὑπὸ  
πολλῶν παρεκλήθησαν ἐπὶ τὸν διδασκαλικὸν βίον  
εἶθαι " and SOZOM. Eccl. Hist. 17 P.G. 67, 1333C " σοφιστεῦν  
δὲ καὶ δίκας ἀγορεύειν ὑπεριδόντες, φιλοσοφεῖν ἐγνώσαν κατὰ  
τὸν τῆς Ἑκκλησίας γόμον ", cf. RUFINUS AQ. P.L.  
21, 518A.



42. Epist. 176 P.G. 37, 288B "καὶ δέχοιο παρ' ἡμῶν τοῦτον ὡς παρ' ἡμῶν, τὸ μὲν ῥητορικὸν ἔργον τῷ πατρὶ χαριούμενος, τὸ δὲ σοφιστικὸν ἡμῖν", and Epist. 189 P.G. 37, 308C "Εἴ καὶ κατωτέρω σοφιστικῶν θρόνων μαθήμεθα, σὺ πᾶσι ἀκίνδυνον γέρας ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ἐπιτάξαντες".
43. Or. 25. 4 P.G. 35, 1201D Sq., Or. 28. 17 P.G. 36, 48C 59. cf. D. F. WINSLOW, The dynamics of Salvation (A study in Gregory of Nazianzus), Philadelphia (USA), 1979, p. 23-24.
44. We use the term in the sense that theology is the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as we will see in the next chapter.
45. THEODOSIUS declared from the beginning his faith as a zealous adherent of the homoousion. Cf. Cod. Theod. 16, 1-2 "Cunctos populos quos Clementiae nostrae regit temperamentum, in tali volumus religione versari, quam divinum Petrum Apostolum tradidisse Romanis religio usque nunc ab ipso insinuata declaret, quamque pontificem Damasum sequi claret, et Petrum, Alexandriae episcopum, virum apostolicae sanctitatis: hoc est ut secundum apostolicam disciplinam evangelicamque doctrinam Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti unam deitatem sub parili maiestate et sub pia trinitate credamus".
46. The Antiochian schism disappeared entirely in 413. Cf. THEOD. Eccl. Hist. 5.35 P.G., cf. N. Q. KING, The 150 Holy Fathers of the Council of Constantinople 381 AD, In SP 1 (1957), pp. 635-641.
47. Cf. MANSI, vol. 3, p. 482 and Codex Theod. 16, 1-3.
48. Cf. the decision of the Fourth Oecumenical Council.
49. Or. 42. 15 P.G. 36, 476 AB.
50. Cf. Carm. Hist. 5 P.G. 37, 1023, vers. 8-12.  
 "Τίς σου τὸ κάλλος, τίς θρόνους ἑμούς ἔχει;  
 πῶς ἐμὲ τέκνος, ζῶσι δ' οἱ παῖδες; Πάτερ,  
 σοὶ δοῖα, κἂν τι τοῦδε χείρον συμπέσοι.  
 ὡς κολάσεις τὴν ἑμὴν παρρησίαν.  
 τίς βοηθήσει ὀρθῶς τὸ σου, Τριάς;  
 and Car. Hist. 8 P.G. 37, 1025 vers. 1-2.  
 Τριάς, σάου με· καὶ πάλιν καλῶ, Τριάς.  
 Σε γὰρ ωροφαίνων ἡμπόλησά μιν φθόνον.
51. Cf. Epist. 193, P.G. 37, 300A.

# CHAPTER I

## NOTES

1. A. LOUTH, The Origins of the Christian mystical tradition, Oxford 1981, p. 76.
2. Or. 28. 16 P.G. 36, 48B. Or. 8.19 P.G. 35, 812B.
3. CH. N. BOUKES, Ἡ Θεολογία κατὰ Γρηγόριον τὸν Ναζιανζηνόν, In Θεολογικὸν Συμπόσιον, a Festschrift to Prof. P. K. CHRESTOU, Thessaloniki 1967, p. 147.
4. 341<sup>c</sup> "Ῥητὸν γὰρ οὐδαμῶς ἔστιν ὡς ἄλλα μαθήματα, ἀλλ' ἐκ πολλῆς συνοουσίας γιγνομένης περὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα αὐτὸ καὶ τοῦ συζῆν ἐξαίφνης, ὅτον ἀπὸ πυρὸς πηδήσαντος ἐξαφθὲν φῶς ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ γενόμενον αὐτὸ ἐκ τῆς ἡδονῆς τῆς ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ἰσχύος" cf. 1b.<sup>d</sup> sq.  
Cf. also Frag. Orph. 233 (E. ABEL, p. 249). "Ἐπιτηρεῖν δὲ χρὴ καὶ μὴ εἰς τὸν πολλὸν ὄχλον καὶ δῆμον ἐκφέρειν τοὺς τοι-  
οῦτους ὕμνους· ἀπιθανώτεροι γὰρ καὶ καταγελαστικώτεροι τοῖς πολλοῖς φαίνονται".
5. Or. 2.5 P.G. 35, 416A.
6. V. LOSSKY, The Mystical theology of the Eastern Church, Cambridge-London 1973, p. 44, sq.
7. Poem. Mor. P.G. 37, 617A. Or. 32.9 P.G. 36, 185A.
8. CH. N. BOUKES, op. cit., p. 145. Or. 4. 110 P.G. 35, 648A.  
"Ὁρῶν γὰρ τὸν ἡμέτερον λόγον μέγαν μένδοντα τοῖς δόγμασι καὶ ταῖς ἀνωθεν μαρτυρίαις, τὸν αὐτὸν παλαιὸν τε καὶ νέον· παλαιὸν μὲν ταῖς προρρήσεσι καὶ ταῖς ὑποστροφῶν τοῦσι κινήμασι τῆς θεότητος· νέος δὲ τῇ τελευταίᾳ θεοφαιδείᾳ καὶ τοῖς ἐκ ταύτης γε καὶ περὶ ταύτην θαύμασιν· ἔτι δὲ μείζω καὶ γνωριμώτερον τοῖς παραδεδομένοις καὶ εἰς τόδε τετηρημένοις τύποις τῆς ἑκκλησίας".
9. Or. 4. 102 P.G. 35, 637B. "Βούλεται γὰρ ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος μὴ ἔξειναι διαπιστεῖν τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν θεοφόρων ἀνδρῶν εἰρημένοις, ἀλλ' ἀποδείξιν εἶναι τοῦ λόγου τὸ θεῖον ἀξιόπιστον, πείσῃς δυνάμειος λογικῆς καὶ ἀντιλογικῆς ἰσχυρότερον".
10. Cf. J. ROMANIDES, Critical examination of the applications of theology, In Festschrift to Metropolitan Chalkidonos Meliton, Thessaloniki 1977, p. 483. The revue has been read as a paper in the Second International Conference of the Orthodox Theological Schools, Athens 1976 (20-30 Aug.). "Pentecost is the final and highest form of revelation when the Holy Spirit

led the apostles into all the truth as promised by Christ, but Pentecost is not a once in history event, it is an ongoing experience and sharing within the Church in the glorification of and by Christ bestowed as a gift upon those who have reached various levels of perfections having passed from purification to illumination and culminating in the higher forms of theoria, to wit theosis or glorification".

11. CH. N. BOUKES, op. cit., p. 147. Cf. J. PLAGNIEUX, Saint Gregoire de Nazianze, Theologian, Paris 1951, p. 46.
12. Or. 21, P.G. 36, 156D.
13. Ib.
14. S. G. PAPADOPOULOS, Πατέρες, Αὐθροισι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, Ἁγίου Πνεύμα, Athens 1970, p. 73.
15. ST. BASIL, Hom. 12 P.G. 31, 389C.
16. Critical examination of the applications of theology, op. cit., p. 474.
17. Or. 23. 12 P.G. 35, 1164C. Cf. also Or. 27. 5 P.G. 36, 17B "Ἐκεῖνό γε συμβῶμεν ἀλλήλοις, μυστικῶς τὰ μυστικά φθέγγεσθαι, καὶ ἁγίως τὰ ἅγια".
18. Les mystères d'Egypt, I.2. Cf. also A. SMITH, Porphry's place in the Neoplatonic tradition (thesis), Hague 1974, p. 83.
19. Metaph. A. 995<sup>a</sup> 14-17.
20. Eth. Nic. 1098<sup>b</sup> 3-6.
21. "Saint Gregory Palamas and the tradition of the Fathers", in SOBOURNOST, Ser. 4, no. 4 (1967), p. 167-168.
22. ALBINUS, Didaskalia, Ch. 5.
23. Enn. 1.3.4. 13ff. Cf. C. W. MACLEOD, Ἀνάγκη: A study in ancient Mysticism, In JTHS 21 (1970), pp. 43-55, and J. THEODORAKOPOULOS, Πλάτων, Πρωτίνος, Ὁριγένης, Athens 1959, p. 57.
24. "Philosophical Implications of Arlanism and Appolinarianism", In DOP 12 (1958), p. 1-8.
25. J. ROMANIDES, Critical examination of the applications of theology, op. cit., p. 490.

26. He uses this method broadly in his theological orations and it is the same method that he followed when he was involved in discussions with the Pneumatomachians. Cf. T. E. POLLARD, "The exegesis of Scripture and the Arian controversy", In Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 41 (1959), p. 428-429.
27. G. FLOROVSKY, Saint Gregory Palamas and the tradition of the Fathers, op. cit., p. 168, Cf. Or. 1. 20 P.G. 35, 781A. "ὡς διαχρῶν τούτων τὰς πιθανότητας".
28. Or. 31. 8 P.G. 36, 141B.
29. Epist. 202 P.G. 37, 332B.
30. Or. 42.6 P.G. 36, 465A. Cf. Or. 21.23 P.G. 35, 1108C. Also ST. GREGORY PALAMAS; ed. SOPHOCLES K. Ex Economōn, Τὸν ἑν ἁγίοις Πατρός ἡμῶν Γρηγορίου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης τοῦ Παλαμά Ὁμολογίαι, Athens 1861, p. 169-170.
31. Or. 3.7 P.G. 35, 524A.
32. See Or. 7.17 P.G. 35, 776C. "Καθαρῶ νῶ καθαράν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐποπτεύοντες". Cf. also Or. 76.9 P.G. 35, 945C. "καὶ τῆς ἀγίας καὶ βασιλικῆς θεωρίας Τριᾶδος, ἑξαμερῆς τρανώτερον τε καὶ καθαρώτερον, καὶ ὅλης ὅλης νοῦ μὲν".
33. Or. 28.21 P.G. 36, 104A.
34. Or. 31.24 P.G. 36, 160B. Cf. ST. BASIL, On PS. 115 P.G. 30, 105AB. "τὸ τῆς θεολογίας μυστήριον, τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἀβυσσάντου πίστεως ἐπιζητεῖ συγκατάθεσιν".
35. "Some technical terms of Greek exegesis". In JTHS 24 (1923), p. 65.
36. Or. 28.11 P.G. 36, 40A.
37. Or. 4, 104 P.G. 35, 640C.
38. Or. 27.1 P.G. 36, 12A. Cf. Ib. 8, 21A. "καὶ ἡ φωνὰρία παιδεύσις ἐδοξε".
39. Ib.
40. Or. 2.104 P.G. 35, 504C. Cf. also Or. 7.13 P.G. 35, 769C.
41. Herm. XVI.2.

42. Or. 36.5 P.G. 36, 272B. Cf. also Or. 21.12 P.G. 35, 1096A. "καὶ ἡ φλναιρία παλιδενσις ἐδὸξε". See G. FLOROVSKY, "Saint Gregory Palamas and the tradition of the Fathers", op. cit., p. 167-168.
43. Or. 27.9 P.G. 36, 24A.
44. Or. 27.2 P.G. 36, 13B.
45. Or. 29.21 P.G. 36, 104A.
46. Or. 29.15 P.G. 36, 93B. Cf. ST. MAXIM. Lib. Abig. P.G. 91, 1264C-1265B. "Πρότασις Ἀρειανῶν, ἔχουν ἔυνομιανῶν καὶ ἐπίχσις τοῦ ἁγίου Πατρὸς ἡμῶν Γρηγορίου". Also A. Z. MASON, op. cit., p. 96, not. 5. D. F. WINSLOW, The Dynamics of Salvation: A study in Gregory of Nazianzus, Philadelphia (USA) 1979, p. 27, states that "Gregory's major complaint against the "technology" of the Eunomians, for instance, was that they claimed to comprehend the incomprehensible, and so reduce/God to the limits of human understanding".
47. Or. 27.5 P.G. 36, 17A. Cf. Or. 2.37 P.G. 35, 444C. "ἐν ὁμοίᾳ μένειν τῆς ἐνσεβείας".
48. Or. 27.3 P.G. 36, 13C. "τὸ περὶ θεοῦ φιλοσοφεῖν".
49. G. BARDY, "Philosophie" et "Philosophe" dans le vocabulaire des premiers siècles, in ZAM 25 (1949), pp. 97-108.
50. The Dynamics of Salvation, op. cit., p. 25. Cf. Or. 12.6 P.G. 36, 849C.
51. Or. 27.3 P.G. 36, 13C.
52. J. ROMANIDES, Critical examination of the applications of theology, op. cit., p. 488. "On and after Pentecost the Holy Spirit reveals to the friends of God both what Christ has from the Father and also Christ the Logos Himself in and through His humanity". Ib.
53. Or. 27.3 P.G. 36, 16A.
54. Chap. 13. Cf. Or. 20.4 P.G. 35, 1069B. "καὶ φιλοσοφῶσα τὰ τελεώτερα".
55. Cf. Herm. apud STOB. except II. A, 6. "Περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀληθῆ νοῶσαι ἐν τοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οἷς ἐάν ὁ θεὸς τὴν θεοπτικὴν δωρήσεται δύναμιν".

56. Ib. B2. "Χωρίς γὰρ φιλοσοφίας εὐσεβῆσαι ἀδύνατον· ὁ δὲ μαθὼν οἶά ἔστι τὰ ὄντα, καὶ πῶς διατέτακται, καὶ ὑπὸ τίνος, καὶ ἔνεκεν τίνος, χάριν εἴσεται ὑπὲρ πάντων τῷ δημιουργῷ".
57. Or. 38.11 P.G. 36, 324A. Cf. Or. 30.6 P.G. 36, 112B.
58. Or. 37.22 P.G. 36, 308AB. "Ὅσῳ γὰρ ψυχὴ τιμιώτερον σώματος, τοσούτῳ τιμιώτερον καὶ ἄραι ψυχὴν ἢ σῶμα". Cf. Or. 11.4 P.G. 35, 836D.
59. Ib. Cf. also Or. 20.5 P.G. 35, 7069C. "Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀνεκαδήραμεν τῷ λόγῳ τὸν θεολόγον" and Epist. 119 P.G. 37, 213C.
60. Ib. T. SPIDLIK, St. Grégoire de Nazianze, Roma 1971, p. 77-78. Cf. also J. M. SZYMUSIAK, Grégoire de Nazianze et le péché, SP9 (1966), pp. 288-305.
61. Or. 42.8 P.G. 36, 468B.
62. Cf. PLATO Resp. 2, 379C and PLOTIN. Enn. 1.8.8, 3.2.5, although the idea is a locus classicus for the Platonic tradition. Cf. TESTIMON. ZOSIMUS PANOPOL. i.5 and PORPHYRY, De abst. I.41.
63. Cf. DIDYMUS ALEX. De Trin. I.19 P.G. 39, 364. "Καὶ ὁντως ἀλήθειαν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὴν ἀγαθότητα τοῦ θεοῦ διδασκοντάς".
64. Epist. 153 P.G. 37, 260B. "Ἀναχωρήσω πρὸς θεόν τὸν μόνον καθαρὸν τε καὶ ἀδόλον". Cf. CLEM. of ALEX., Strom. 5.1 P.G. 9, 17B. "Ὅς δὲ καθарοὶ δὲ τῷ καρδίᾳ τὸν θεόν ὄψονται ἔπαν εἰσὶν ἐσχάτην ἀφικνῶνται τελείωσιν".
65. Or. 38.13 P.G. 36, 325B. Cf. also Or. 45.9 P.G. 36, 633C. "Τῷ ὁμοίῳ τὸ ὁμοιον". A. SMITH, Porphry's place in the Neoplatonic tradition (thesis), Hague 1974, p. 118, about the meaning of the "like by like" in Neoplatonism.
66. Phaed., 67.<sup>b</sup>
67. A. J. MASON, op. cit., p. 5, not. 1.
68. Or. 27.3 P.G. 36, 13D.
69. Cf. Frag. Orph. 228 (E. ABEL, p. 247): "καὶ κινδυνεύονσι καὶ οἱ τὰς τελετὰς ἡμῖν οὗτοι κατατίσαντες οὐ φανερὸι τινες εἶναι, ἀλλὰ τῷ ὄντι πάσαι αἰνίττεσθαι, ὅτι, ὅς ἂν ἀνύκτος καὶ ἀτέλεστος εἰς Αἴδου ἀρίκῃται, γενεοβόρῳ κείσεται, ὁ δὲ κεκαθαρμένος τε καὶ τετελεσμένος ἐκείσε ἀφικόμενος μετὰ θεῶν οἰκήσει. Εἰδὼς γὰρ δὴ, φασὶν οἱ περὶ



τας τέλειτας, γαρθηκοφόροι μὲν πόλαιοι, βάκχοι δὲ παῦροι ".  
Cf. Or. 20.12 P.G. 35, 1080B.

70. Or. 20.4 P.G. 35, 1069A.

71. Or. 16, 2 P.G. 35, 1045B. " Παιδεῦσαι πρὸς ἡσυχίαν  
ἅπαντας τῷ ἀρχετῆρι τῆς σιωπῆς ".

72. Or. 27.3 P.G. 36, 16A.

73. Or. 32.14 P.G. 36, 189BC. Cf. also D. L. PSARIANOS, bishop,  
Λόγος Παρακλήσεως, Kozanē 1967, p. 3-4.

74. Or. 20.5 P.G. 35, 1069C. " Εὐχαίμαι δὲ τὸ τοῦ Σολομῶντος  
παθεῖν, μηδὲν ἰδίον ἐννοῆσαι περὶ θεοῦ, μηδὲ φθέγ-  
ζασθαι ". Prov. 30, 2.

75. Cf. B. N. TATAKES, Ἡ περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διδασκαλία  
τῶν Πατέρων τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μας, In Μελετήματα Χρι-  
στιανικῆς φιλοσοφίας, Athens 1967, p. 31. Cf.  
ST. BASIL, Hom. 15 P.G. 31, 169C and P.G. 29, 604C. " ταῖς  
παρὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος παραδοθείσας ἡμῖν θεολογίας ".

76. Or. 28.17 P.G. 36, 48A.

77. Or. 28.19 P.G. 36, 52B. Cf. Or. 20.5 P.G. 1069D. " Ὡς οὐχ ἔ-  
χων ἰδίαν διπλάτῃ φρόνησιν, ἐνερχομένου δὲ τήν  
θείαν τε καὶ ὑπερτέραν ".

78. Or. 28.3 P.G. 36, 29AB.

79. Critical examination of the application of theology, op. cit.,  
p. 488.

80. Ib.

81. Ib.

82. Ib. "This unity in the truth of the glory of the Holy Trinity  
with each other, to wit this unity in theosis or glorification  
in which those thus glorified have the same faith and under-  
standing of faith based on the same experience of theosis or  
glorification is the very core and summit of Christ's teaching  
and action brought to their highest consummation in Pentecost".

83. Carm. Hist. 82 P.G. 37, 1428, vers. 5-6. " Ἀὐτὰρ ἑμοὶ Χριστὸς  
πλῶντος μέγας, ὅν ποτ' ἴδριμι / νῶ ὀνυμῶ καθαρώς· ἀλλὰ τε  
κόσμος ἔχει ". Cf. also Carm. Hist. 17 P.G. 37, 1264,  
vers. 35-36. " Ἀλλὰ νόον καθαροῖσι νοήμασιν αἶεν



ἀέζων, ἥδη καὶ τριάδος ἄσεται οὐρανίης". Carm. Hist. 1  
P.G. 37, 973 ver. 43. "Οἱ δὲ θεὸν καθαρῇσι νόον  
λευσοῦντες ὀπωπαῖς".

84. Or. 32.33 P.G. 36, 212A.

85. Op. cit., p. 501.

86. Or. 38.12 P.G. 36, 324B.

87. Ib.

88. Or. 27.3 P.G. 36, 16A. Cf. PROCL. In Grat. 93.5 (KROLL,  
p. 52) "Ὅθ' γὰρ ἐφικτὰ τὰ θεῖα θεοτοῖς τοῖ σῶμα νοοῦσιν, ἀλλ' ὅσοι  
γυμνήτες ἄνω σπεύδουσι πρὸς ὕψος".

89. Or. 32.14 P.G. 36, 189C. Cf. also Or. 2.39 P.G. 35, 448B.  
"Ὅθ' μόνον ὅτι ἐν τρισὶ τούτοις τοῦ κινδύνου σαλεύοντος, διανοία  
καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἀκοῇ, ἀναγκαῖον περὶ ἓν γέ τι τούτων, εἴ καὶ μὴ  
πάντα, προσπταῖσαι· ἡ γὰρ οὐκ ἀνέλαμβη γοῦς, ἡ λόγος ἠσθένησεν,  
ἡ οὐκ ἐχώρησεν ἀκοή μὴ κεκαθαρμένη· καὶ ὁμοίως ἐξ ἑνὸς τού-  
των καὶ πάντων χωλεῖν ἀνέληται τὴν ἀλήθειαν".

90. Or. 27.4 P.G. 36, 16B.

91. Or. 27.3 P.G. 36, 16A.

92. Or. 24.7 P.G. 35, 1172B. "καὶ καλοῖς μέτροις θεοῦ, τοῦ πάντα  
ἐν σλαδμῷ καὶ μέτρῳ διορίζοντός τε καὶ διευδύ-  
νοντος". Cf. also Or. 32.20 P.G. 36, 197A. Or. 40.34  
P.G. 36, 408C.

93. Or. 41.5 P.G. 36, 436D. See about the sense of measure in  
ST. GREGORY'S thought, J. PLAGNIEUX, Saint Grégoire de  
Nazianze Theologien, op. cit., p. 213-214 and D. G. TSAMES,  
"Ἡ περὶ μεσότητος διδασκαλία Γρηγορίου τοῦ  
θεολόγου". In KLERONOMIA I (1969), pp. 275-283.

94. Or. 27.4 P.G. 36, 16C.

95. Critical examination of the applications of theology, op. cit.,  
p. 502, and not. 15. See also his treatises: "Notes on the  
Palamite Controversy and related topics, Part II", in GOTHR  
9.2 (1963-1964), pp. 225-236, "The Christological Teaching of  
St. John of Damascus" in Papers, Dialogue Eastern and Oriental  
Churches, ed. by Metrop. METHODIUS of Aksum, Athens 1976,  
pp. 41-52.

96. Frag. Orph. 301. (E. ABEL, p. 269). Cf. ST. BASIL, Hom. 15 P.G. 31, 464B.
97. Les Mysteres d' Egypt, 3.18
98. Cf. Procl. In Alc. 517.36 and in Remp. 97.285 (KROLL, p.
99. Corp. Herm. 9.10. Cf. 1b.5.9 "  $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  (sc. god)  $\delta$   $\tau\bar{\omega}$   $\nu\acute{o}\iota$  θεωρητός ", and PLOT. Enn. 6.9.4.
100. ed. A. WESTERMANN, Paris 1850, lib. 3, 59.
101. Or. 28.1 P.G. 36, 25D.
102. Ib. " Προσθησάμενοι τοῦ λόγου τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ τὸν Υἱόν, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, περὶ ὧν ὁ λόγος ".
103. Or. 38.8 P.G. 36, 320B and Or. 45.4 P.G. 36, 628C. " Μὴ θεολογία τὸ προειμένον ἡμῖν, ἀλλ' οἰκονομία, θεοῦ δὲ ὅταν εἴπω, λέγω Πατρός καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ".
104. Or. 23.11 P.G. 35, 1161C and Or. 26.19 P.G. 35, 1252C. CH. N. BOUKES, " CH θεολογία κατὰ Γρηγόριον τὸν Ναζιανζηνόν ", op. cit., p. 151.
105. Or. 30.17 P.G. 36, 125C.
106. Or. 32.25 P.G. 36, 204A.
107. The terms theologia and Economy have been discussed and elucidated precisely by D. F. WINSLOW in his thesis, The dynamics of salvation, op. cit., pp. 23-43 and 77-119.
108. Cf. ST. MAX. CONF., Ad Thal. 60 P.G. 90, 624BC. " Οὐ γὰρ ἡ γνῶσις τοῦ υἱοῦ τὴν σάρκωσιν ὁ Πατήρ, ἢ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· ὅτι ἔνθα τῷ υἱῷ τὸ μυστήριον αὐτουργοῦντι τῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας διὰ σαρκώσεως, ὅλος κατ' οὐσίαν ὁ πατήρ· οὐ σαρκοῦμενος, ἀλλ' ἐνδοκῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ τὴν σάρκωσιν· καὶ ὅλον ἔνθα τῷ υἱῷ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον κατ' οὐσίαν ὑπῆρχεν· οὐ σαρκοῦμενον, ἀλλὰ συνεργοῦν τῷ υἱῷ τὴν διήκεις ἀπόρρητον σάρκωσιν ".
109. The distinction between Theologia and Economy ("οἰκονομία") is a common locus in the Cappadocian Fathers. Cf. ST. BASIL, P.G. 29, 577A and ST. GREGORY of NYSSA, Cont. Eun. P.G. 45, 685C.

## CHAPTER II

### NOTES

1. Cf. Doxasticon of Stichera in Vespers of the Sunday preceding Quinquagesima:  
"Ἐκάθισεν Ἀδὰμ ἀπέναντι τοῦ παραδείσου,  
καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν γυμνώσειν ὀρνῶν ὠδύρετο..."
2. Psal. 8, 4. Cf. Psal. 18, 2.
3. Or. 28.6 P.G. 36, 33A "καὶ ἅπαν ἀγνώμων, ὃ μὴ μέχρι τούτων προῶν  
ἐκουσίως, καὶ ταῖς ἀνσικαῖς ἐπόμενος ἀποδείξειεν".
4. B. KRIVOSHEIN, 'The ascetic and theological teaching of Gregory Palamas', in ECQ, (1938), vol. III, no. 1, p. 28. Cf. Or. 20.11 P.G. 35, 1077D-1080A.
5. A. J. MASON, op. cit., p. 29, not. 4.
6. Or. 28.19 P.G. 36, 49C.
7. Cf. PORPHYRIUS, De Abst. ii, 34 "τὴν αὐτῶν ἀναγωγὴν θυσιῶν ἑρὰν προσάγειν τῷ θεῷ, τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ καὶ ὕμνον ὄντα καὶ ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν"  
and Som. Scip. I. 7, 3.
8. Or. 28.16 P.G. 36, 48B. The point will be developed more by ST. MAXIMUS, who is also an ancient scholiast of ST. GREGORY. See Ambig. Lib. P.G. 91, 1085BC and infra chapter IV.
9. Cf. N. CH. BOUKES, "Ἡ Θεολογία κατὰ Γρηγόριον τὸν Ναζιανζηνόν", Tome in honour of Prof. P. K. CHRESTOU, Thessaloniki 1967, p. 144.
10. Cf. ARISTED., Apol. 1, 2.
11. JOAN. DAM., De Fid. Orth. 1.3 P.G. 94, 796A ff.
12. ATHEN., Leg. 7.1 P.G. 6, 904B. Cf. also THEOPH., Ad Autol., 1.6 P.G. 6, 1033A.
13. Or. 28.6 P.G. 36, 32C. Cf. XEN. Cyrop. 8, Corp. Herm. v. 3, 4, 8.  
"καὶ ἀνδριάντα μὲν ἢ εἰκόνα χωρὶς ἀνδριαντοποιοῦ ἢ ζωγράφου  
οὐδεὶς φησι γεγονέναι· τοῦτο δὲ τὸ δημιούργημα χωρὶς δημι-  
ουργοῦ γέγονε;"

14. Carm. Dogm. I.1 P.G. 37, 430. "Τοῦ παντός εἰς τιν' ἀναφέροντες ἀίτιαν ποιητικὴν τε καὶ συνευτικὴν ὄλων"
15. "Τί γάρ ὄντι αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν καὶ τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἐπάρχει τόμῃ ἀρχὴν ἔχειν, μὴδ' ἐξίστασθαι, μὴδ' περατοῦσθαι"  
ARIST. De. Mund. 2, 2. Cf. PLAT. Res P. 380D.
16. The theme has been discussed in earlier centuries, particularly by such Theologians of the Alexandrian School as CLEMENT and ORIGEN. A further inquiry is not considered necessary here.
17. I Cor. 13, 12 and Gal. 4, 8. Cf. P. EVDOKIMOV, 'L'Esprit Saint dans la Tradition Orthodoxe' (in Greek), p.33 and Or.15.12 P.G. 35, 933A "Γινώσκων τοὺς ἰδίους καὶ γινωσκόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων, ὁμο- λογούμενος καὶ ὁμολογῶν, δοξάζομενός τε καὶ δοξάζων"
18. Corp. Herm. X. 14<sup>b</sup> "Οὐκ ἄρα ἀγνοεῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὁ θεός, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάν- τινος γινώσκει, καὶ θέλει γινωρίζεσθαι". See especially the first book of the Corpus.
19. Or.29.21 P.G. 36, 104A.
20. Or.28.28 P.G. 36, 68A. Cf. BASILIUS ALIOR. SCHOL., P.G. 36, 903A "Ὅπερ ἔστιν ἡ λεγομένη διπλῇ ἀγνοία. Ὅτι δὲ πλάτων βού- λεται ταύτην καλεῖν, πρῶτος εἰς ταύτην ἐκκληνῶς τὴν ἐννοίαν"
21. Or.20.12 P.G. 35, 1080C.
22. Or.32.23 P.G. 36, 201A.
23. Or.28.17 P.G. 36, 48C. Cf. also Oracula Chaldaica, KROLL, op. cit., p.16 "Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο σιγῶμενος καλεῖται ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῷ νῷ συνωδεῖν λέγεται καὶ κατὰ νοῦν μόνον ὑπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν γινωρίζεσθαι"
24. See Corp. Herm. IX. 10 "Ὁ δὲ νοῦς μέγας ἔστι, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου μέχρι τινὸς ὁδηγηθεὶς, φθάνει μέχρι τῆς ἀληθείας"  
1b, XII. 1 "Ὁ ὅτιος δὲ ὁ νοῦς γεν μὲν ἀνθρώποις θεός ἔστι· διὸ καὶ τινες τῶν ἀνθρώπων θεοὶ εἰσι, καὶ ἡ τοῦτον ἀνθρωπότης ἐγγύς ἔστι τῆς θεότητος".
25. Or.31.8 P.G. 36, 141B.
26. Cf. for another approach C. BUTLER, The Vatican Council, vol.II, Canon 1, Chap. 2, London 1830: 'If anyone shall say that the One true God, our Creator and Lord, cannot be certainly known by the natural light of human reason through created things; let him be anathema'.

27. A doctrine which will be developed by ST. GREGORY PALAMAS in the fifteenth century. Cf. OMNIA OPERA, ed. P. CHRESTOU, vol.II, pp.69-95.
28. Or. 31.8 P.G. 36, 141C.
29. Or. 38.7 P.G. 36, 317B.
30. 1b, C.
31. See for example DIDYM. De. Trin. 2, 1 P.G. 39, 449A, ST. ATHAN. De Decr. 11 P.G. 25, 433C<sup>9</sup>, ST. JO. DAMASC. De Fid. Orth. 1.4 P.G. 94, 797B. Cf. S. HARKIANAKES, 'Die Trinitatslehre Gregor von Nazianz', in KLERONOMIA I (1969), p.100 and G. FLOROVSKY, 'Saint Gregory Palamas and the tradition of the Fathers', in SOBORNOST, ser 4, no.4 (1961), pp.173-174.
32. Or. 38.7 P.G. 36, 317C 'ἵνα καὶ αὐτὸς πάσῳ τῷ ὄσῳ"
33. Ps. 36, 7.
34. Or. 28.6 P.G. 36, 33A. Cf. Or. 31.8 P.G. 36, 141C.
35. W. BOUSSET, Die Religion des Judentums in Späthellenistischen Zeitalter, Tübingen 1926, p.363.
36. See De Somn. I.2, 62, p.218 (Wendland III) and De cher. 14.49 (Cohn I, p.182). Cf. also J. DANIELOU, Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture, p.342.
37. Strom. V, 11 P.G.
38. C. Cels. VII, 45 P.G. 11, 1488AB
39. Strom. V, 11 P.G. 9, 109A
40. Ὁμιλία Πνευματικαί, P.G. 34, 753C Cf. Or. 38.7 P.G. 36, 317B.
41. B. KRIVOSHEIN, The ascetic and theological teaching of Gregory Palamas, op. cit., vol.III (1938), p.27. Cf. P.G. 150, 1117B.
42. In Tim. II, 117C.
43. Cf. for example Frag. Orph. 50 (ABEL, p.170), Frag. 52 (ABEL, p.171), Frag. 72 (ABEL, p.181). C. Herm. (Stob.) 25, 2, ib, V 10b, PLOT. Enn. VI 7, 15. PHIL. Frag. 654 M. (KROLL, p.66).
44. DAMASCIUS, Dub. et Sol. 61, I. p.132 (RUELLE). Certainly ST. GREGORY knows precisely the methodological principles of PLATO and ARISTOTLE. Cf. Or. 31.2 P.G. 36, 133Dsq. "τὸ μὲν οὖν ἐπιμελῶς ἐξετάζειν καὶ διακρίνειν, ποσάχως... νοεῖται καὶ λέγεται".

45. Or.28.4 P.G. 36, 33A.
46. 28C.
47. J. DANIELOU, Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culutre, London - Philadelphia (1973) pp.107-110. cf. CLEM. OF ALEX. Strom. 5.12 P.G. 9.416Bsq.
48. JUST. II Apol. X, 6. ATHEN. Suppl. 6, TERT. Apol. XLVI, 9. Cf. A. D. NOCK, The Exegesis of Timaeus 28c, in VC 16 (1962) pp.79-86.
49. C. Her. Stob. exc. I, 1.2. I think that D. F. WINSLOW'S interpretation about the origin of ST. GREGORY'S citation is incomplete, since, as it seems, he is ignorant of the tradition of the text and J. DANIELOU'S treatise of its tradition in christian authors. The Dynamics of Salvation, op. cit., p.29, not.1.
50. OTTO, JUSTIN OPERA II, 1879, Cohort. 36E-37B.
51. Protr. VI, 68.1. Cf. Strom. V, 12.78, 2.
52. Strom. V, 14.92, 1-4.
53. JUST. Dial. LVI, 4. CLEM. ALEX. Strom. V, 13.86, 2. 1b, 14. 133, 7, THEOPH. Ad Aut. 11, 4.
54. J. DANIELOU, Gospel Message ... op. cit., p.110. Cf. also Scholia Addit. ad Eliae Comm. P.G. 36, 899B, for a strict criticism against Plato and the Corpus Hermeticum.
55. Or.28.13 P.G. 36, 44A.
56. Carm. Dogm. I, 1 P.G. 37, 507.
57. S. PAPADOPOULOS, "Γρηγόριος ὁ θεολόγος καὶ αἱ προὑποθέσεις τῆς Πνευματολογίας αὐτοῦ" Athens 1975, p.113. Cf. H. PINAULT, La Platonisme de Saint Grégoire de Nazianze, (thèse), La Roche-Sur Yon 1925, pp.73-82. E. F. OSBORN, The philosophy of Clement of Alexandria, Cambridge 1957, chapter 2.
58. Or.31.10 P.G. 36, 144B.
59. Cf. his poem "De Vita Sua" P. G. 37, 1029-1166
60. Cf. DIONYSIOS L. PSARIANOS, bishop, Λόγος Παρακλήσεως (itro.) KOZANE, 1967, pp.1-10.
61. J. PLAGNIEUX, Saint Gregoire de Nazianze, Theologien, Paris 1951, pp.306-319.
62. S. PAPADOPOULOS, Γρηγόριος ὁ θεολόγος... op. cit., p.119.



63. L'Esprit saint dans la tradition Orthodoxe, op. cit., p.84.  
Cf. S. E. GERSH, Κίνησις Ἀκίνητος, A study of Spiritual Motion in the Philosophy of Proclus, Leiden 1973, pp.83-94 about the origin and use of analogy in Neoplatonism.
64. ST. GREGORY is explicit: "καὶ οὐδὲ νῦν, εὖ ἴσθι, ταῦτ' ἂν ἐγράφα-  
μεν, εἰ μὴ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἑωρῶμεν διασπωμένην καὶ τεμνομένην  
καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις τερατείαις καὶ τῷ νῦν "συνεδρίῳ τῆς ματαιότητος".  
Epist. 101 P.G. 37, 192C. Cf. P. GALLAY, Gregoire de Nazianze  
Lettres Theologiques, sc.208, Paris 1974 p.68, n.1. J. KARMIRES,  
Ἡ Ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ Ἁγίου Γρηγορίου τοῦ θεολόγου, Athens 1960,  
p.39. As also B. KRIVOSHEIN noticed 'the ecclesiastical writers  
usually had a practical purpose of edification and if they went  
into purely abstract discussion it was only to refute the attacks  
of heretics', op. cit., in ECQ, vol.III, no.1 (1938), p.32, n.3.
65. Or.30.16 P.G. 36, 125A.
66. Or.31.30 P.G. 36, 168C.
67. Or.31.2 P.G. 36, 133D-136A. Cf. EPICURUS, Διατριβὴ 1.17 "Ἀρχὴ  
παιδεύσεως ἡ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐπίσκεψις".
68. C. Cels. I.24.
69. Cf. Or.27.5 P.G. 36, 17C "Ἀλλ' εἰδῶμεν, ὥς περ... οὕτω καὶ λόγου  
καὶ σιωπῆς, ὅτι καὶ λόγον πρεσβεύομεν μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων τοῦ θεοῦ  
προσηγορίων, καὶ δυνάμεων"
70. C. Cels. I.24. P.G. 11, 705A
71. 1b
72. W. KROLL, Oracula Chaldaica, Hildesheim 1962 p.58. Cf. E. R. DODDS,  
Theurgy and its Relationship to Neoplatonism, in JRS, vol.37  
(1947), pp.55-99.
73. C. Cels. I.25. P.G. 11, 708B
74. Or.4.76 P.G. 35, 601B.
75. CLEM. Excerpta 82. P.G. 9, 696C
76. E. ABEL, op. cit., p.286, Hymn. Mag. 1. On this account ORIGEN  
says that christians preferred to be put to death than call on  
Zeus. C. Cels. I.25. Cf. Papyri Graecae Magicae VII, p.560  
"ἢ κέ μοι, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ αεροπετές, καλῶν μενον συμβόλοις καὶ ὀνό-  
μασιν ἀφθέρητοίς".



77. GENESIS, 3.19 . ST. GREGORY accused the Arians of misusing the names in order not to accept the homoousion. Cf. Or. 21.22 P.G. 35, 1105C-1108A.
78. Legis Alleg. i, 30 (i, 62).
79. PSEUDO-ELIAS (Pseudo-David), Lectures on Porphyry's Isagore, ed. L. G. WESTERINK, Amsterdam 1967, 9, 15-17.
80. Or. 30.17 P.G. 36, 125B.
81. Op. cit., p.135, not.1.
82. Ant. 11.2, 4.
83. Stom. I.23 P.G. Cf. Schol. in P.G. 36, 125, no.63.
84. De Spir. Sanct., 18 P.G. 32, 148D
85. Or. 30.17 P.G. 36, 125B.
86. lb. I think that the passage comes verbatim from CLEMENT OF ALEX. Strom. 5.10 P.G. 9, 100B "ὁ γὰρ τῶν ὄλων θεός, ὃς ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν φωνήν καὶ πᾶν νόημα καὶ πᾶσαν ἐννοίαν, οὐκ ἂν ποτε γραφῇ παραδοθέν, ἀρρητος ὢν δύναται τῇ αὐτοῦ"
87. Parm. 142A. Cf. also DAM. Dub. et Sol. I 151, 18 ff (RUELLE). Cf. JAMBL. frag. 2A, in Parm. (DILLON, p.208). "ὅτι μὲν τοῖσιν οὔτε δόξα οὔτε διανοία οὔτε νῶ τῶ ψυχικῶ οὔτε γοῆσι μετὰ λόγου ημελιωτοῦ, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τῇ τοῦ νοῦ περιωπῇ οὔτε τῶ ἀνθε τοῦ νοῦ αἰρετοῦ, οὔτε ἐπιβολῇ ὅλως, οὔτε κατὰ ἐπέρεισιν ὠρισμένην οὔτε κατὰ περιλήψιν οὔτε τινα τοιοῦτον τρόπον εὐεῖνο γνωστόν".
88. lb. J. M. DILLON, Jamblichus Chalcidensis, in Platonis Dialogos Commentariorum Fragmenta, Leiden 1973, pp.208 and 392.
89. JUSTIN, Apol. II.6 P.G. 6, 453A Cf. PLATO, Crat. 400<sup>d</sup> "οἱ περὶ τῶν θεῶν οὐδὲν ἴσμεν, οὔτε περὶ ἀνθρώπων οὔτε περὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων, ἅττα ποτε ἑάντοὺς καλοῦσιν· ἄλλου γὰρ θεοῖς εὐεῖνοί γε ἐαληθῆ καλοῦσι".  
and EURIP., Her. Fur. 62.
90. lb.
91. 'L'Esprit saint dans la tradition Orthodoxe', op. cit., p.31. Cf. also G. HABRA, The Patristic Sources of the Doctrine of Gregory Palamas on the Divine Energies, II. The Three Cappadocians, in ECHQ, 12 (1957-1958), p.299.
92. Com. in Exod. P.G. 87, 593.

93. Epist. 234 P.G.32, 668Csq. Cf. also Epist. 8 P.G.32, 96B sq.
94. Quod non sint Tres Dei, P.G. 45, 121A. Cf. 1b, B. "ὡς καὶ τοῦτου δέκνυσθαι μὴ αὐτὴν τὴν θέαν εἶναι ὑπὸ τινος τῶν ὀνομάτων σεβη-  
μειῶσθαι, ἀλλὰ τι τῶν περὶ αὐτὴν διὰ τῶν λεγομένων γνωρίζεσθαι".
95. De Fid. Orth. 1.10 P.G. 94, 840A "Τὰυτα οὖν εἰδότες (sc. ὀνόματα),  
καὶ καὶ τούτων περὶ τὴν θέαν οὐσίαν χειραγωγούμενοι, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν  
οὐσίαν καταλαμβάνομεν, ἀλλὰ τὰ περὶ τὴν οὐσίαν"
96. 1b, 1.12 P.G. 94, 845BC.
97. 1b.
98. Cf. PROCL. in Crat. 66.16 "οὐδὲ γὰρ δι' ὀνομάτων γνωρίζεσθαι πε-  
ρὶ αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ οἱ θεολόγοι ὑπορρῶθεν αὐτὰ ἐπημύνουσιν ἐν τῇ τῶν φαι-  
νομένων πρὸς εὐεῖαν ἀναλογίᾳ"
99. Comm. in Tim. III frag. 71, (DILLON, p.360). Cf. ST. GREGORY  
PALAMAS also express a similar idea "οὕτω τῶν θεότητων εἰδότες  
λεγομένην καὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ οὐσίαν καὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνέργειαν." Διά-  
λογος ὁρθοδόξου μετὰ Βαρθολααμίτου.  
§ 27, ed. P. CHRESTOU, vol. II, 189-190.
100. P.G. 150, 1202B. Cf. also JAMBL. De Myst. d' Agypt. 8.9 There is an  
analogy and an ontological order parallel to the outward flowing  
movement from the one in Plotinus.
101. Cf. CLEM. ALEX. Strom. 5, 12 P.G.9, 121B The One is "ἀγνώμαστον·  
κῶν ὀνομάζωμεν αὐτό ποτε οὐ κυρίως καλοῦντες ἥτοι ἓν ἢ τὰ γὰρ οὐ  
ἢ νοῦν ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ ὄν... οὐ γὰρ τὸ καθ' ἑκάστον μηνυτικὸν τοῦ θεοῦ,  
ἀλλὰ ἀσφύτως ἅπαντα ἐνδεικτικὰ τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δυνάμεως".
102. Or. 30.19 P.G. 36, 128C "Τὰυτα μὲν οὖν ἔστι κοινὰ θεότητος  
τὰ ὀνόματα".
103. Exod. 3, 14.
104. Or. 30.18 P.G. 36, 128A.
105. 'Ammonius on the Delphic E', in CQ 45 (1969), p.189. Cf. also  
G. REALE, The Concept of First Philosophy and the Unity of the  
Metaphysics of Aristotle, trans. J. R. CATAN, New York 1979, p.23  
and PLATO Symp. 211A, Tim. 37E, Phil. 59D, Sophist. 248A.
106. Cf. J. N. D. KELLY, Early Christian Doctrines, London 1977, p.9.

107. De Trin. I.15 P.G. 39, 297A.
108. Cf. G. K. BONES, Ἀμφιλόχιος ἱκονίου καὶ Μέγας Βασίλειος, Thessaloniki 1949, p.21 and B. N. TATAKES, Ἡ Ἑλληνικὴ Πατερικὴ καὶ Βυζαντινὴ φιλοσοφία, in periodical "Δενκαχίων", no.14, pp.169-177 (ATHENS).
109. L'Esprit saint dans la tradition orthodoxe, op. cit., p.82.
110. ST. GREGORY PALAMAS, κατάλογος τῶν ἑυβαϊνόντων ἀποπῶν ἐν τῶν τοῦ φιλοσόφου Βαβλαᾶ προτάσεων, Orat. 2.2, 12 ed. P. CHRESTOU, vol.I, p.666.
111. Paed. I.7 P.G. 8, 336A.
112. Or.38.7 P.G. 36, 317B and Or.45.3 P.G. 36, 625C. The text became a common locus in the following centuries. Cf. ST. JO. DAM. De Fid. Orth. I.13 P.G. 94, 583C and 836B.
113. Epist. I ad Serap. P.G. 26, 596B. "Τριάς δέ ἐστιν οὐχ ἕως ὀνόματος μόνον καὶ φαντασίας λέξεως, ἀλλὰ ἀληθεία καὶ ὑπάρξει Τριάς. ὥστε γὰρ ὁ ὢν ἔστιν ὁ πατήρ, οὕτως ὁ ὢν ἔστι καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς ὁ τούτου λόγος. καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον οὐκ ἀνύπαρκτον ἔστι, ἀλλ' ὑπάρχει καὶ ὑφίστηκεν ἀληθῶς".
114. Or.38.3 P.G. 36, 313C.
115. Or.41.9 P.G. 36, 441B. The text has been transmitted almost unaltered in the Hymnology. Cf. also P. I. BRATSIOTES, Ἡ διαμέσου τῶν αἰώνων ἐπιβίωσις τῶν τριῶν ἱεραρχῶν, Athens 1972, pp.15-18.
116. Tim. 37e. Cf. P.G. 36, 910B.
117. DIELS, Vorsokv, p.143 ff. " (τὸ ὄν) αἰ ᾗν ὅ,τι ᾗν καὶ αἰ ἔσται... ἔστί τε καὶ αἰ ᾗν καὶ αἰ ἔσται... ἀνιδῶν ἔστι καὶ ἀπειρον καὶ ἐν καὶ ὁμοιον καὶ πᾶν "
118. 392B. Cf. also Or.38.3 P.G. 36, 313C.
119. Lib. II 354C. Cf. L. PHILIPPIDES, Ἱστορία τῆς ἐποχῆς τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, Athens 1958, p.594, not.3.
120. 1, 4-8.
121. Or.28.3 P.G. 36, 29A. Cf. Exod. 33, 23.

122. 1b. Cf. E. A. CLARK, Clement's use of Aristotle, The Aristotelian contribution to Clement of Alexandria's refutation of Gnosticism, New York - Toronto 1977, p.78.
123. 1b.
124. Or.28.5 P.G. 36, 32C. Cf. D. F. WINSLOW, Christology and Exegesis in the Cappadocians, in CH 40 (1971), p.341, and J. DANIELOU, La θεωρία chez Gregoire de Nysse, in SP 41 (1972), pp.130-145.
125. Or.30.18 P.G. 36, 125C.
126. 1b, 128A.
127. The use of the indefinite particle " κάν " is note worthy.
128. Crat. 397C. Cf. also H. A. WOLFSON, Philo, Cambridge - Massachusettes 1948, vol.II, pp.136-137.
129. Cf. ST. ATHANASIUS, De Def. VI P.G.28, 536BC, also ST. JO. DAM. De Fid. Orth. 1.9 P.G. 94, 837AB.
130. Cf. ST. BASIL, Epist. 234 P.G.32, 869A " Αλλ' ἂν μὲν ἐνέργειαι ποικίλαι; ἡ δὲ οὐσία ἀσπλην. Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐν μὲν τῶν ἐνεργειῶν γνωρίζειν λέγομεν τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν, ἐν δὲ τῇ οὐσίᾳ αὐτῇ προσεγγίζειν οὐκ ὑπισχνούμεθα. Αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐνέργειαι αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς κατὰ βάλλουσιν, ἡ δὲ οὐσία αὐτοῦ μένει ἀπρόσιτος"  
Also ST. GREG. NYSS. P.G. 45, 828A. ST. JO. DAM. De Fid. Orth. 1, 9 P.G. 94, 836A.
131. Or.33.17 P.G. 36, 236C-237A " Ἄρ' οὖν ἀπλῶς εἰς ταῦτα (sc. ἐξαπτεῖσθαι), ἢ καὶ τι κοινὸν τούτων ὄνομα; Ναὶ κοινόν. τί τόντο; Σηλαδὴ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. Εἰς τόντο τὸ κοινὸν ὄνομα πίστευε".
132. Or.23.12 P.G. 35, 1164C " Ἀρνησις ἀθείας καὶ δμολογία θεότητος. Τούτω γὰρ τὸ κοινὸν ὄνομα". Cf. also Or.40.55 P.G. 36, 424A.
133. Or.29.13 P.G. 36, 92A " Ὅντω δὲ καὶ θεοῦ μίαν οὐσίαν εἶναι καὶ ἐν-σιν, καὶ ὁμοῦσιν".
134. Or.34.16 P.G. 36, 236A. See a complete discussion of this point in chapter VI, p. 8<sup>sq.</sup> of this treatise.
135. Or.30.18 P.G. 36, 128A.
136. Cf. Wisd. Sol. 14.21 " τὸ ἀκαινώνητον ὄνομα"
137. ORIG. Sch. in Ps. 2, 1-2 P.G. 12, 1104AB.

138. Or. 30.17 P.G. 36, 125B.
139. Or. 30.8 P.G. 36, 113B. Cf. Ephes. 1, 17. Also Or. 31.29 P.G. 165B.
140. Or. 34.11 P.G. 36, 252B.
141. 1b.
142. Ezek. 18.31.
143. Or. 34.13 P.G. 36, 233A. Cf. SO. JO. DAM. Schol. in Epist. I Cor. 8-6, P.G. 95, 632A.
144. Or. 38.8.P.G. 36, 320BC "Ὅτι μὲν οὖν τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, αἱ καὶ τοῖς σεραφίμ συγκαλνύσονται, καὶ δοξάζεται τρισὶν ἁγιασμοῖς, ἑσμὴν συν-  
ωῶσι κυριότητα καὶ θεότητα". Cf. DIDYM. De Trinit. 2.6 P.G. 39, 552AB.
145. The term has been used abundantly by the Fathers from ST. GREGORY onwards. Cf. for example ST. CYRIL ALEX., Quod Unus sit Christus, P.G. 75, 1276D, ST. JO. DAM. De Fid. Orth. 1.10 P.G. 94, 837BC (de divina unione et distinctione).
146. Ad Autol. 1.4 P.G. 6, 1029B.
147. Disp. 37 P.G. 28, 488C. Cf. Rev. 1, 4-8.
148. Epist. II Ad Serap. P.G. 26, 609C. About the use of the name "παντοκράτωρ" in the Credo see J. N. D. KELLY, Early Christian Creeds, op. cit., pp.131-139.
149. C. Eun. II P.G. 45, 537C.
150. Carm. Mor. Ad Aruph. Seleuc. P.G. 37, 1590A.
151. De Trin. I.15 P.G. 39, 301B. Cf. Frag. Orph. 238, 239 (ABEL p.251).
152. Or. 30.19 P.G. 36, 128B.
153. Or. 30.4 P.G. 36, 108B. Cf. PLATO, Epist. 2
154. 1b. Cf. also ELIAS CRET. comment at this point "Ἡ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ παρόντος οὐκ ἀπαρνέται... τὸ μέλλον, ἀλλὰ παρεκτείνεται τούτῳ " P.G. 36, 816B and S. AGOURIDES, " θεὸς καὶ εἰσοπορία κατὰ τοῦς Καππαδόκας ", in Ekk1. 43 (1966), p.153-154.
155. 1b.

156. Or. 19.17 P.G. 35, 1064B. "θεότητα μίαν, δόξαν, καὶ τιμὴν καὶ οὐ-  
σίαν, καὶ βασίλειαν μὴ μεριζομένην" Cf. also DIDYMUS ALEX. De  
Trinit. I. 31 P.G. 39, 424A "Ἰαφὲς δέ, ὅτι βασιλείαν λέγει,  
ἣν ἔχει ἀδιαίρετον, καὶ ἀδιάδοχον μετὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου  
Πνεύματος, νῦν τε καὶ εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα αἰῶνα".
157. Hom. 9 P.G. 77, 601A.
158. Or. 19.17 P.G. 35, 1064B "Ὅτι αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα, καὶ ἡ τιμὴ, καὶ ἡ προσ-  
κύνησις εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων".
159. lb.
160. Or. 23.13 P.G. 35, 1165B.
161. Or. 38.8 P.G. 36, 320AB "Τοῦτο τοῖς ἀγίοις αἰῶνι, τὸ συμπάρ-  
εῦταινόμενον τοῖς ὁσιν". In addition it must be stressed  
that this interpretation of the name of the king of the ages,  
comes from the biblical tradition. Cf. Tob. 13, 6 and A. Tim.  
1, 17. Also ST. JO. DAM. De Fid. Orth. 2.1 P.G. 94, 861B-864C.
162. P. GALLAY, SC. 250 p. 264, takes the genitive "τῶν δυνάμεων"  
and "τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ" separately. I prefer MASON'S correction,  
op. cit., p. 137, not. 7 "τῶν δυνάμεων τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ" as more  
biblical. See Ps. 67, 13.
163. Schol. in Ps. 67, 13 P.G. 128, 665D.
164. Schol. in Ps. 67, 13 P.G. 145, 1421D.
165. I Tim. 6, 15.
166. 1 Pet. 2, 9
167. Cf. THEOPHYLACTUS Bulg. Arch. Schol. I Tim. P.G. 125, 84C.
168. Or. 30.19 P.G. 36, 128B "καὶ ὁ κύριος, ἡ βασιλεύς, ὅπερ ἐστὶ σπράτι-  
ων, ἡ τῶν δυνάμεων, ἡ τῶν κυριευόντων". Cf. B. BURESCH,  
Ἀπόλλων Κλάριος, Leipzig 1889, p. 49, PLATO, EP. 2. 312E.
169. Schol. in Ps. 23 P.G. 17, 116B. Cf. THEODORETUS KYR., Schol. in  
Ps. 23, 10 P.G. 80, 1036A "Ὁ τῶν δυνάμεων κύριος αὐτός ἐστι ὁ  
ἐδοικὴς τῆς δόξης, τὸν τέστιν ὁ ἀρχηγὸν καὶ ἀρχαγγέλιον, καὶ πᾶσι τῆς  
ἀρετῆς καὶ γεννητῆς φώσεως, ποιητὴς ἐσὶ καὶ δημιουργὸς"., also in Genes.  
P.G. 80, 55A "χερουβὶμ καλεῖ πᾶν τὸ δυνατὸν οὕτως λέγει, ὁ κατή-  
μενος ἐπὶ τῶν χερουβὶμ, ἀντὶ τοῦ, ὁ δυνάτος δυνατῶν".



170. Or. 30.19 P.G. 36, 128B. cf. TERT. de Spectaculis, Chap. 143 [ed. E. DEKKERS in Cor. Christi and R. D. SIDER, "Tertulian, on the shows. An analysis", in JTHS 39 (1978), pp. 334-365.
171. The same evidence comes from ST. CYRIL OF ALEX. who also cites the Ps. 67.21 as ST. GREGORY does. P.G. 69, 1153B "Μόρος γὰρ αὐτοῦ θεοῦ ὃν τοῦ σώζειν καὶ πηγὴ σωτηρίας, ἐξ ὅδους ἑρῶν τοῦ θανάτου, ἀνα-  
στὰς ἐν νεκρῶν". The last phrase especially indicates that the God of Salvation is a name of the incarnate God who has risen from dead. THEODORETUS CYR., names God the origin of salvation, Schol. in Ps. P.G. 80, 1389A. Cf. D. F. WINSLOW, The Dynamics of Salvation (thesis), Philadelphia (U.S.A.), 1979, pp. 99-119 (chapter V, The Economy of the Body of Christ, Death).
172. Yisrael (יִשְׂרָאֵל) is the name of Jews according to Jacob's name. Cf. Gen. 43, 7-10. CYRIL OF ALEX., in Ps. P.G. 69, 1168C "Αὐτὸς οὖν ὁ τοῦ πνευματικῶν ἱσχυρὰ θεός, ἵστων δὲ εἰπεῖν ὁ τῶν ἀγγέλων  
θεός".
173. CYRIL, Schol. in Ps. P.G. 69, 852CD and OECUMENIUS TRICAE, Comm. in Gal. P.G. 118, 1144D "τοῦς χριστιανούς, κατὰ ἑπαγγελίαν εἶ-  
ναι ἐπέρμα Ἀβραάμ".
174. Cf. THEODORETUS CYR., Schol. in Ps. P.G. 80, 1209B "θεοὶ τὰ κῶβ ὀνο-  
μάζει τὸν Χριστόν... ὅν ἐν ἀρχαῖς τεθέστανται (sc. the  
Fathers of Israel), οὗ τὸ μυστήριον οὐκ ἠγνόησαν, ἀποκαλύπτου-  
σθαι δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός, καὶ διὰ τῆς φωταγωγίας τοῦ ἁ-  
γίου πνεύματος".
175. Gen. 3, 10.
176. Schol. Add. ad Eliae Comm. P.G. 36, 902B.
177. ST. CYRIL. in Ps. P.G. 69, 1236CD.
178. Or. 30.14 P.G. 36, 121C. Cf. also ST. BASIL, P.G. 31, 1473A.
179. Op. cit., p. 138, not. 4.
180. sc. 250 p. 267.
181. Cf. Rom. 15, 13. Cf. ST. JO CHRYS., Hom. 16 Ad Hebr., P.G. 63, 124.
182. LNPF, ser. 2, vol. 7, p. 316.
183. Or. 30.19 P.G. 36, 128B.
184. Or. 22 P.G. 35, 1145C. Or. 31.25 P.G. 36, 161Csq. Cf. also P. GALLAY, op. cit., Sc. 250, p. 326, not. 2 and A. THEODOROU, ἡ περὶ δειώσεως τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διδασκαλία τῶν ἑλλήνων πατέρων, Athens 1956, p. 159sq.



185. Or. 31.26 P.G. 36, 160D-164C.
186. Γρηγόριος ὁ Θεολόγος... op. cit., p.122sq.
187. lb.
188. Or. 31.25 P.G. 36, 160D-161A.
189. Or. 31.8 P.G. 36, 141AB.
190. The division has been introduced by the Pneumatomachian disputer in the previous paragraph of the same oration.
191. Cf. ST. GREGORY PALAMAS, Περὶ Ἑκπορεύσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, 2, 16 ed. P. CHRESTOU, Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμά Συγγραμματα, vol. I, p.93. Also G. MANTSARIDES, "Ἡ ἔννοια τοῦ Θεολογίας", in KLERONOMIA I (1969), p.118. JO-M. SZYMUSIAK, Elements de Theologie de l'homme selon Saint Gregoire de Nazianze, Roma 1963, pp.7-24.
192. John 15, 26 see the verb "ἐκπορεύεται".
193. Or. 31.8 P.G. 36, 141AB.
194. Op. cit., p.154, not. 14.
195. Vol. 7, p.320. Cf. also P. GALLAY'S French translation, op. cit., (sc. 250, p.291).
196. History of Dogma, [trans. N. BUCHANAN], New York 1963, vol. 4, p.114, not. 1.
197. About the relation between Macedonians and Pneumatomachians see S. PAPADOPOULOS, Γρηγόριος ὁ Θεολόγος..., op. cit., p.29sq.
198. Epist. 101 P.G. 37, 193A. Cf. P. GALLAY, Gregoire de Nazianze Lettres Theologiques, sc. 208, Paris 1974, p.69, not. 4.
199. T. E. POLLARD, 'The Exegesis of Scripture and the Arian Controversy', in the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 41 (1959), pp.417-418. Cf. also ST. GREGORY'S Canon of the Holy Scriptures, Poem. ad Seleuc. P.G. 37, 1594-1598.
200. Heb. 12, 26.
201. Or. 31.25 P.G. 36, 160D-161A "δύο χεχόνασι μεταθέσεις θείων ἐπιφανείων εκ τοῦ παντός αἰῶνος, αἱ καὶ δύο διαδύχαι καλοῦνται, καὶ σεισμοὶ ᾧης, διὰ τὸ τοῦ ὡράματος περιβόητον· ἡ μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων ἐπὶ τὸν νόμον, ἡ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου πρὸς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. Καὶ τρίτον σεισμόν εὐαγγελισόμεθα τήν τε τεῦθεν ἐπὶ τὰ ἑκείσε μεταστῆσιν, τὰ μὴ κέει κινούμενα, μὴ δὲ σαλευόμενα".

202. Hagg. 2, 6 with reference to the incarnation.
203. This idea was in common with the Greek Philosophers. Cf. M. KERTSCH, Ergänzende Bemerkungen zum Aufsatz ein Bildhafter Vergleich bei Seneca, Themistios, Gregor von Nazianz und sein Kynisch-Stoischer Hintergrund, in VCR 30 (1976), pp.241-275 and 31 (1977), pp.298-307.
204. Cf. ELIAS CRET., Schol. P.G. 36, 838A.
205. Cf. Or. 36.18 P.G. 35, 1252C "καὶ ἡμῖν τῶν ἐντεῦθεν μόχθων ἀντιδόσης τὰ ἐπουράνια τε καὶ ἀσπλασσία τῶν δ' ἐστὶ τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ μέγιστον ἔχαμφοθηδαί σοι ἐλεώτερον". Cf. P. EVDOKIMOV, L'Esprit Saint ... op. cit., p.141.
206. Or. 31.26 P.G. 36, 161C. Cf. ST. JO. CHRYS. Hom. 28 P.G.
207. 1b. Cf. also ST. GREGORY PALAMAS, Λόγος Ἀποδεικτικός II, 18.
208. 1b. Cf. M. E. HUSSEY, The Theology of the Holy Spirit in the writings of St. Gregory of Nazianzus, in DIAKONIA, XIV, 3 (1979), p.231.
209. Cf. CYRIL ALEX. P.G. 69, 512B "Τελειότης γε μὴν αὐτοῦ (sc. νόμου) καὶ προφητῶν νοεῖται Χριστός". Also, The Prayer of the Priest in front of the Table of Oblation after the Communication: 'Christ our God, who art the fulness of the Law and Prophets, fulfilling the totality of the Father's dispensation, fill our hearts with joy and gladness now and for ever'; A. KOKKINAKIS, The Liturgy of the Orthodox Church, London-Oxford 1979, p.134. cf. APPENDIX I, p.275.
210. Cf. M. HARL, 'From glory to glory', in Kyriakon, Festschrift J. Quasten, Munster 1970, pp.730-735.
211. KEI YAMAMURA, The Development of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Patristic Philosophy: ST. BASIL and ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA, in ST. V. TH. Q. 18 (1974), p.14. Cf. also S. HARKIANAKES, "Τὸ Ἄγιον Πνεῦμα ὡς ἑρμηνεύς τῶν Εὐαγγελίου καὶ ῥωοδότης τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης Ἐκκλησίας", in KLERONOMIA 4 (1972), p.413.
212. A. RADOVIC, Ὁ τριαδολογικὸς χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πνευματολογίας, in θεολογικὰ Μελέται no. 1 (ed. δ' Ἡλίας τῆς Ῥωμῆς), Athens 1971, pp.11-12.
213. Or. 31.28 P.G. 36, 164CD.

CHAPTER III

NOTES

1. Or.25.15 P.G. 35.1220A, cf. BASILIUS MINIMUS' comments on this passage in P.G. 36.1176A.
2. De Vita Pythag. 1.1.
3. E. GILSON, The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy, trans. A. H. C. DOWNES, London 1936, p.443.
4. Strom. 5.13 P.G. 9, 128, cf. ST. GREGORY'S Or.28.13 P.G. 36.44B.
5. L. J. PHILIPPIDES, Ἡστορία τῆς ἑποχῆς τῆς Καινῆς Διαθῆκῆς, Athens 1958, p.51sq.
6. Act. 17.16sq.
7. L. J. PHILIPPIDES, op. cit., p.52, cf. also W. K. C. GUTHRIE, Orpheus and Greek Religion. A study of the Orphic Movement, London 1952.
8. THEOPHYLUS, Ad. Autol. 3.1 P.G. 6, 1121, cf. also Cohort. 15 and Fragmenta Orphica, E. Abel, Lipsiae-Pragae 1885, p.144, III.4 and p.166.43.
9. Frag. Orph., op. cit., p.146.V.
10. See Appendix II.
11. Cf. Deut. 5.6-7.
12. Frag. Orph., op. cit., p.145.4 and 148.7.
13. 1b, p.182.72.
14. 1b, p.61, VIII.1.
15. CLEMENT, Strom. 5.14 P.G. 9, 189B.
16. Frag. Orph., op. cit., frag. 161, cf. also Appendix A.
17. L. PHILIPPIDES, op. cit., p.76.
18. ILIAD, I.445-6.
19. H. RITTER - L. PRELLER, Historia philosophica Graeca, Cotha 1934, p.11sq.

20. lb, p.16-17.
21. Cohort. 19.
22. Metaph. A.986<sup>b</sup> 20.
23. Poemata de se ipso P.G. 37.1074A, vers. 658-59:  
"... ἡ Μονὰς τριάδεθ', ἡ Τριάς πάλιν  
ἐνίξετ' ἀμφοῖν ἐνθ' ἑως νοουμένη".  
Cf. also Or.4i P.G. 36.417C.
24. CLEMENT, Alex. Strom, 5.14 P.G. 9, 172sq and DIELS, I p.159.33"νό-  
μος καὶ βουλῇ πείθεσθαι ἑνός".
25. DIELS, I p.153.
26. H. RITTER - L. PRELLER, op. cit., p.150/350b.
27. L. PHILIPPIDES, op. cit., p.99.

CHAPTER IV

NOTES

1. J. DANIELOU, Gospel-Message and Hellenistic Culture (Vol. II), trans. J. A. BAKER, London 1973, pp.107-127.
2. Or.29.2 P.G. 36, 76B.
3. Or.23.8 P.G. 35, 1160C.
4. D. STANILOAE, Ἁγίου Μαξίμου ὁμολογητοῦ φιλοσοφικὰ καὶ θεολογικὰ ἐρωτήματα, ed. APOSTOLIKE DIAKONIA of the Church of Greece, Athens 1978, trans. I. G. SAKALLES, Introd., p.16-17. Cf. also P. SHERWOOD, The Earlier Ambigua of ST. MAXIMUS the Confessor and his Refutation of Origenism, Romae 1955.
5. ST. MAX. De Var. Deffic. Loc. P.G. 91, 103Asq.
6. lb.
7. J. A. DORNER, History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, trans. D. W. SIMON, Edinburgh 1862, div. 1, vol. II, p.150sq. Cf. also NPNF p.320, not. b and Or.25 P.G. 35, 1221A, Or.23.8 P.G. 35, 1160.
8. ST. ATHANASIUS, Or. IV, Cont. Ar. P.G. 26, 505Csq. Passim. Ep. IV, Ad Serap. P.G. 26, 644Bsq.
9. J. N. D. KELLY, Early Christian Doctrines, London 1977, p.23.
10. C. BIGG, The Christian Platonism of Alexandria, Oxford 1886, p.252.
11. lb. p.251.
12. Or.29.2 P.G. 36, 76B. Cf. J. A. DORNER, op. cit., div. 1, vol. II, pp.304-306.
13. N. - J. S. BOUSSOULAS, Ἡ δημιουργικότης τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ἡ μεταγενεσικὴ τῆς Πλατωνικῆς μείξεως, Thessaloniki (undated), p.99.
14. Plat. Soph. 254Csq.

15. lb, 144C.
16. Plat. Phil. 66b.
17. Plat. Parm. 143sq.
18. J. M. DILLON, Jamblichus Chalcidensis; in Platonis Dialogos Commentariorum Fragmenta, Leiden 1973, p.29sq.
19. lb, p.32 (intr.).
20. Carm. Dog. I. I. P.G. 37, 507-508. Cf. J. PLAGNIEUX, op. cit., p.332, not. 192.
21. DILLON, op. cit., p.30.
22. DAMASCIUS, Dubit. et Sol. 43, I, p.86 (C. A. RUELLE).
23. lb, 50, 101.
24. Or.21 P.G. 35, 1084C.
25. DILLON, op. cit., p.33.
26. lb.
27. P.G. 10, 1088sq, "Εὐεζαωάτητόν τε πάλιν ὑπὸ λόγου καὶ εὐκόλον πρὸς συγκατάθεσιν ψυχὴ ἀνθρώπου, εἰ τοίμῃ τε πρὶν διακρίνη καὶ ἐξετάσῃ πάντα τρόπον, ὑπὸ ἀμύχνητος καὶ ἀσθενείας τῆς ἰδίας, ἢ ὑπὸ λεπτότητος τῆς τοῦ λόγου πρὸς τὴν ἀκρίβειαν τῆς ἐξετάσεως ἀποκαμύσαν ἑαυτὴν ἀπραγμονέστερον παραδιδόναι πολλακίς ψευδέσι λόγοις καὶ δόγμασι, πεπλανημένοις μὲν αὐτοῖς, πλανῶσι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐσχηκότας".  
Cf. DIELS, p.282.
28. ST. GREGORY uses also this term to define the relation between the Father and Son, Or.29.16, "σχέσεως δὲ καὶ τοῦ πῶς ἔχει πρὸς τὸν Υἱὸν ὁ Πατὴρ".
29. Cf. MARIUS VICTORINUS, Hymn III, p.638 (HADOT) 'Status, Progressio, O beata trinitas'. PLOT. En. III, 8.7, 17 and P. AUBIN, 'L'image dans l'oeuvre de Plotin' in RSR, tom 41 (1953), pp.373-377.

30. In later neoplatonic tradition the theurgy is justified as way of analogy as the divine νοῦς is the "μένων" and the next creation as "πρόϊόν". Cf. Jamb. De Myst. 139.1 —  
 "Μένοντος δ' αὐτοῦ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ταῦ τε σημεῖα καὶ τὴν μαντείαν ὅλην ὡρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπιστρέφει καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ προΐοντα αὐτὰ ἀνευρίσκει".
31. In Tim. frag. 53, DILLON, op. cit., p.160.
32. Or.21 P.G. 35, 1084C, 'Μακάριος οὗτος, τῆς τε ἐντεῦθεν ἀναβάσεως, καὶ τῆς ἐκείσε θεώσεως, ἣν τὸ γνησίως φιλοσοφῆσαι χαρίζεται, καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ τὴν ὕλικήν δυνάδα γενέσθαι, διὰ τὴν ἐν τῇ Τριάδι νοουμένην ἐνότητα".  
 Cf. ST. MAXIM. Lib. Asc. P.G. 90, 916D, "Ἄλλ' ἡμεῖς ἀσθενεῖς ὄντες, καὶ ὕλικοι τῇ διανοίᾳ".
33. Or.23.8 P.G. 35, 1160.
34. G. C. STEAD, 'The Thalia of Arius and the testimony of Athanasius, in JTHS 29 (1978), p.30.
35. Epist. ad Serap. P.G. 26, 636B, "Ἐκ μεταβολῆς καὶ προκοπῆς λέγονσι συνίστασθαι τὴν Τριάδα, καὶ δυνάδα μὲν εἶναι, ἐκδέχεσθαι δὲ κτίσματος γενέσιν, ἵνα ... γένηται ἡ Τριάς".  
 Cf. Jambl. Theolog. Arith., ed. V. de FALCO, Lipsiae 1922, pp.13-15.
36. Or.23.8 P.G. 35, 1160.
37. Sch. Anonymi in Greg. Naz. Orationes P.G. 36, 908AB.
38. JAMBL. Theolog. Arith. op. cit., p.8.
39. Or.20,7 P.G. 35, 1073A, Epist. 178, P.G. 37, 293A, "καὶ τῷ καθάρωτάτῳ φωτί... τῷ ἐν τῇ τρισσῇ μονάδι θεωρουμένῳ".
40. H. N. BATE, 'Some technical terms of Greek exegesis', in JTHS 24 (1923), pp.61-63.
41. A. SMITH, Porphry's Place in the Neoplatonic tradition, (thesis), Hague 1974, p.7. Cf. also Plot. Enn. II, 9.8 and En. VI, 2.22.



42. Hipp. Haer. 6.23 P.L. 16, 3227B.
43. Metaph. 1088<sup>a</sup>6. Cf. W. D. ROSS, ARISTOTLE'S METAPHYSICS, vol. II, Oxford 1924, p.473.
44. DIELS, Doxogr. p.304.
45. BASILIUS MIN., Schol. in Orat. de Her. P.G. 36, 1169D. Cf. Carm. I. I., De Spir. Sanc. vers. 37-38.
46. In ARISTOTLE for example "κίνησις" is a synonym for "παύσασθαι", Top. 120b26.
47. DIELS, Doxogr. p.302, "περὶ τῆς (sc. dyad) ἐστὶ τὸ ὑλικόν πλῆθος". In Hermetist the use of the "μονὰς" as "ἐξικῶν" of the 'uncaused cause' of all things is an analogous illustration by which the "ἀρχὴ πάντων" is comprehended. Lib. IV, 10. Cf. also Or. 29.11 P.G. 36, 89A, "καὶ οὕτω σεβάσμιον τοῖς μὴ πάντῃ χαμαιπετέσι καὶ ὑλικοῖς τὴν διάνοιαν". Cf. also ST. MAX. Lib. Asc. P.G. 90, 916D, "ὑλικοὶ τῇ διανοίᾳ".
48. De Var. Deffic. Loc. P.G. 91.1085C sq.
49. lb. 1089BC. Cf. also BASILIUS ALIORUMQUE, Sch. in S. Gregor. Orat., e codicibus monacensibus excerpta, P.G. 36, 904AB.  

"λέγει ἐκ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ματαιότητος εἰς τὴν Ἑκκλησίαν εἰσφρῆσαι ὑποβάσεις τινὰς τῶν οὐσιῶν, ἐκ τῶν ἀνωτάτω καὶ θεῶν μέχρι καὶ τῶν ἐσχάτων προιούσας. Πολλὰ τοιαῦτα Ἰουλιανὸς ὁ τὰς χαλδαϊκὰς γράφας ὑποτυπώσεις ματαιολογεῖ. Οὐχ ἥττον καὶ οἱ τοῦτου ἐβατολόγησαν ἐξηγηταί, Πορφύριος καὶ Ἰαμβλῆχος καὶ Πρόκλος ὁ Πλατωνικός, ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου αἰτίου καθ' ὑπόθεσιν πάντα βαθμυδὸν κατεῖναι κατασειράς σειράς ἄχρι τῶν τελευταίων καὶ τὴν τῶν ὄντων, ὡς αὐτοὶ φασί, ἀποπεράτωσιν, ὡς ἐκ τούτων καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀχρόνως καὶ ἀπαραχάκτως τὸ ἔστιν ἔχόντων καὶ ὁμοούσιον θεῶν ὑποστάσεων καὶ τούτους τὰ τοιαῦτα συλλογιζομένους κατασοφίζεσθαι".

50. D. STANILOAE, op. cit., p.28 (intro.).
51. Or.23.8 P.G. 35, 1160C.
52. Or.34.8 P.G. 36, 248D-249A.
53. ST. GREGORY elucidates the meaning of the term "δεσποτεία" (that might be side by side with "μόναρχια") and excludes from this any kind of Tyranny.
54. In this passage "φύσις" means the created beings in Aristotelian fashion of expression. Cf. Physics, Passim.
55. Or.34.8 P.G. 36, 249A.
56. The philosophical theory about the participation of all beings in the essence of God abolishes the biblical and Patristic theology of Creation. Cf. L. G. BENAKES, 'Η Ἐποὺδὴ τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Φιλοσοφίας, in 'PHILOSOPHIA' 1 (1971), pp.390-433, Athens.
57. Or.34.8 P.G. 36, 248D-249A.
58. Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius, Leiden 1968, p.121, where ST. ATHANASIUS' passage P.G. 25, 4A, "ἡ μὲν περὶ τῆς θεοσεβείας καὶ τῆς τῶν ὄλων ἀληθείας γνῶσις" is quoted.
59. G. FLOROVSKY, 'Eschatology in the Patristic Age : An introduction' in SP II, 1957, p.244.
60. ib, 243. Cf. G. QUISPTEL, The origins of the gnostic Demiurge, in KYRIAKON, vol. I, p.271sq.
61. E. P. MEIJERING, Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius, op. cit., p.130.
62. 'The fourth Century', in SOBORNOST, ser. 7, no. 6, 1978, p.436.
63. B. OTIS, The Throne and the Mountain, An essay on Gregory Nazianzus, in CJ 56 (1961), p.147. Cf. P. CHRESTOU, "Ἀκτιστοῦ καὶ κτιστοῦ, ἀγέννητου καὶ γεννητοῦ εἰς τὴν θεολογίαν τοῦ Μεγ. Ἀθανασίου" in THEOLOGICA MELETEMATA, Thessaloniki 1975, p.12sq.
64. G. FLOROVSKY, Creation and Redemption, Belmont (USA) 1976, p.47.
65. G. FLOROVSKY, Saint Gregory Palamas and the Tradition of the Fathers, in SOBORNOST, ser. 4, no. 4 (1961), p.175.

66. J. N. KARMIRIS, Τὰ δογματικά καὶ συμβολικά Μνημεῖα, vol. I, Athens 1960, p.175. Cf. Mansi, vol. VII, pp.108-117. O. PAPADOPOULOU-TSANANA, Ἡ ἀνθρωπολογία τοῦ Μεγάλου Βασιλείου, (thesis), Thessaloniki 1970, pp.82-6. E. D. MOUTSOULAS, Ἡ Σάρκωσις τοῦ Λόγου καὶ ἡ Θέωσις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν Γρηγορίου τοῦ Νύσσης, (thesis), Athens 1965. Cf. F. QUERE-JAULMES, Les Peres Sont-ils Jansenistes? Remarques sur la traduction classique de Gregoire de Nazianze, in RSR 1971 (45), p.274.
67. F. M. YOUNG, 'A Reconsideration of Alexandrian Christology' in JEH, 22 (1971), p.108sq.
68. Cont. Eunom. 3.2 P.G. 29, 660, "Θυὸ γὰρ λεγομένων πραγμάτων, θεότητος τε καὶ κτίσεως, καὶ δεσποτείας καὶ δουλείας...τῆς τε ἐκ γένεως ἰσχυρόσης τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ τῆς ἐκ προαιρέσεως κατορθούσης". Cf. F. QUERE-JAULMES, L'aumone chez Grégoire de Nysse et Gregoire de Nazianze, in SP VIII (1966), pp.449-455.
69. Alike ST. ATHANASIUS theologized about the Holy Spirit; he centralized the problem of the divinity as for the Son so for the Holy Spirit on the confession of their uncreated. Epist IV Ad serap. P.G. 25, 648B. Cf. P. CHRESTOU, Ἡ Ἀκτιστοσύνη καὶ ἡ Κτιστοσύνη ἀγέννητων... op. cit., p.12.
70. De Fid. Orth. I. P.G. 94, 796A and 3.4 P.G. 94, 997C.
71. Or. 40.45 P.G. 36, 424A.
72. ib.
73. Infra p.  
Cf. E. A. CLARK, Clement's use of Aristotle. The Aristotelian Contribution to Clement of Alexandria's refutation of Gnosticism, New York - Toronto 1977, pp.77-78.
74. Or. 31.4 P.G. 36, 137B, "Χρόνω γὰρ ἀπὸ θεοῦ τεμνόμεθα"  
Cf. also Or. 25.15 P.G. 35, 1220C and G. FLOROVSKY, Creation and Redemption, op. cit., p.43sq.
75. Ex. 3, 14.

76. ST. GREGORY of NYSSA identifies the diastema with the Creation, P.G. 44, 729C, 'Τὸ δὲ διαστημα οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ κτίσις ἐστίν.' Cf. B. OTIS, 'Gregory of Nyssa and the Cappadocian Conception of Time', in SP XIV (1976), pp.327-357.
77. Or.38.7 P.G. 36, 317B. Cf. also St. John Dam. De Fid. Orth. I. 13 P.G. 96, 583C.
78. Epist. 101 P.G. 37, 192A, "Εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο, τί κωλύει καὶ πάλιν γεννηθῆναι Χριστὸν εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ προδοθῆναι πάλιν ὑπὸ ῥούδα καὶ σταυρωθῆναι καὶ ταφῆναι καὶ ἀναστῆναι, ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὰ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀκολουθίας, κατὰ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν ἀνακύνησιν, τὰ αὐτὰ περιφερούσης τῆς αὐτῆς τῶν ἀστρῶν κινήσεως"

Cf. also Or.37.3 P.G. 36, 284C-285A.

79. Or.43.30 P.G. 36, 537B. Cf. also Or.39.13 P.G. 36, 348D-349B about the Old and New Adam, viz. Jesus Christ. It must be noted that the contrast Mastery-Service occurs here.
80. D. G. TSAMES, Ἡ διαλε�τική φύσις τῆς διδασκαλίας Γρηγορίου τοῦ -θεολόγου, (thesis), Thessaloniki (Greece) 1969, p.20sq.
81. D. S. WALLACE-HADRILL, The Greek Patristic view of Nature, New York 1968, p.70. Cf. Or.29.10 P.G. 36, 88A.
82. The term is indebted to Prof. D. TSAMES, op. cit., p.21.
83. lb. Cf. also G. FLOROVSKY, Eschatology in the Patristic Age, op. cit., p.241-42.
84. D. TSAMES, op. cit., pp.22-23. Cf. also J. F. CALLAHAN, 'Greek Philosophy and the Cappadocian Cosmology', in DOP 12 (1958), p.38. J. DANIELOU, 'La typologie de la semaine au i<sup>e</sup> siecle' in RSR 35 (1948), p.382sq. D. G. TSAMES, "Ἡ ὁχδὸν ἡμέρα" in EETHTH, vol. 12 (1969), pp.11-58 (anatypon) [Επιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς θεολογικῆς Ἰσολῆς Θεσσαλονίκης]
85. ST. BASIL, Hex. 28 P.G. 30, 49C-52B. Cf. Epist. 120 P.G. 37, 216A, 29 P.G. 37, 64B.
86. Or.29.2 P.G. 36, 76B.
87. SANCTUS BARSANUPHIUS, Doctrina circa opinionones Origenes, Euagrii et Didymi, P.G. 86, 891-892. The crucial passages follows thus:

"καὶ παρὰ μὲν τῆς ὅλης λαβὼν τὸ σῶμα ἤδη  
προϋποστάσης, παρ' ἑαυτοῦ δὲ ζῶντι ἐνθάδε, ὃ δὴ νο-  
ερὰν ψυχὴν καὶ εἰκόνα θεοῦ ᾔδεν ὁ λόγος".

Or. 38 P.G. 36, 321<sup>CD</sup> which ST. MAXIMUS interprets by his doctrine of the so called logoe ("λόγοι") pre-existed into the logos as prototypes of the things. Cf. D. STANILOAE, op. cit., p.28.

88. lb, P.G. 86, 901A.

89. lb, 901B.

90. lb, "καὶ ἀκούσατε τὴν κατὰ θεὸν πληροφορίαν, τὴν πρὸ  
πριῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ γράψαι ὑμᾶς τὴν ἐρώτησιν γενομένην μοι".

91. Cf. JUSTINIANUS, Liber adv. Origenem P.G. 86, 945-994 and E. CHRYSOS, The ecclesiastical Policy of Justinian in the dispute Concerning the three Chapters and the fifth Ecumenical Council, (thesis, in Greek), Thessaloniki 1969.

92. Op. cit., P.G. 91, 1036C.

93. Or. 30.18 P.G. 36, 128A-B.

94. D. STANILOAE, op. cit., p.60, not. 1.

95. Op. cit., P.G. 91, 1036C. ST. ATHANASIUS had already foreseen the peril of a completely rational explanation of the point at issue whereby stoic principles have been entered into Christian belief. C. Arian. IV 13 P.G. 26, 484C.

96. As in ST. GREGORY "περὶ αὐτὸν (sc. God) σκιαγραφοῦντες  
τὰ κατ' αὐτόν" Or. 30.17 P.G. 36, 125B.

97. Op. cit., P.G. 91, 1036B.

98. Op. cit., P.G. 91, 1217AB. Cf. Or. 18.42 P.G. 35, 1040C-1041AB.

99. ARIST. Περὶ γενέσεως καὶ φθορᾶς, 324<sup>b</sup> 9-14 "θι... τὰ μὲν  
τῶν ποιητικῶν ἀπαθῆ τὰ δὲ παθητικά, καὶ ὥπερ κινήσεως τὸν αὐτὸν ἔχει  
τρόπον καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ποιητικῶν. ἐκεῖ τε γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον ἀκίνητον, καὶ ἐπὶ  
τῶν ποιητικῶν τὸ πρῶτον ποιοῦν ἀπαθές. Ἔστι δὲ τὸ ποιητι-  
κὸν αἴτιον ὡς ὅθεν ἢ ἀρχὴ τῆς κινήσεως. τὸ δ' οὗ ἕνεκα οὐ ποιητικόν."  
Cf. Phys. 259<sup>a</sup> 13sq.

100. JUST. Lib. adv. Or. P.G. 86, 979C and Tract. Con. Monophysitas, a theological treatise based upon ST. GREGORY'S trinitarian terminology, P.G. 86, 1103A-1145C. Later the Sixth Ecumenical Council declaired panegyrically ST. GREGORY'S orthodoxy, including him among the Saints and the blessed Fathers. A. K. ALEBIZATOS, Ὁ Ἁγὸς Κανόνες, Athens 1949, pp.75-76.
101. Cf. Chap. 3 and ST. MAX. 16 P.G. 91, 1185A, "Ἀπειρον οὐδαμῶς ὑενδέχεται δυνάδα.". Also S.R.C. LILLA, The Notion of Infinititude in Ps. - Dionysius Areopagita', in JTHS 31 (1980), pp.93-103.
102. A. J. MASON, op. cit., pp.181-182, not. 14. Cf. S.C. 250, p.333, not. 1.
103. Gen. 3, 159.
104. Or. 24.19 P.G. 35, 1193B, "Καὶ τὴν τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος ἔλαμψιν, ἧς σὺ νῦν παρὰστάτης, τελεωτέραν τε καὶ λαμπροτέραν ἡμῖν χαρίζομενος, ἣν προσκυνούμεν, ἣν δοξάζομεν, ἣ συμπολιτενόμεθα, προσκυνῶντες Πατέρα Ἐν Υἱῷ, Υἱὸν Ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι".  
Cf. P. EVDOKIMOV, L'esprit Saint dans la tradition orthodoxe trans. (in Greek) S. K. PLEURAKES, Thessaloniki 1973, p.71.
105. Or. 31.28 P.G. 36, 164C. ST. BASIL is more explicit and concrete, "Ἡ τοίνυν ὁδὸς τῆς θεογνωσίας ἐστὶν ἀπὸ ἐνὸς πνεύματος, διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς Ἰεσοῦ, ἐπὶ τὸν ἕνα Πατέρα· καὶ ἀνάπαλιν, ἡ φηνοικὴ ἀγαθότης, καὶ ὁ κατὰ φύσιν ἁγιασμός, καὶ τὸ βασιλικὸν ἀζίωμα, ἔκ Πατρός, διὰ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς ἐπὶ τὸ πνεῦμα διήκει".  
De Spir. Sanc. 18 P.G. 32, 153.



CHAPTER V

NOTES

1. Carm. I, 1 P.G. 37, , vers. 3-4.
2. For the characteristic tendencies of later Neoplatonism see H. ZUMPT, "Über den Bestand der Philosophischen Schulen in Athen und die Succession der Scholarchen", In Abhandlungen der Königlich Akademie des Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Berlin 1844, pp. 27-119.
3. Carm. I, 1 P.G. 37, , vers. 5-6.
4. Or. 34, 8 P.G. 36, 249A.
5. The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church, Cambridge-London 1973, p. 4459.
6. C. Arian. I P.G. 26, 49AB. ST. ATHANASIUS' view is worthy of an extensive quotation. "Εἰ γὰρ νῦν ἐν Τριάδι ἡ θεολογία τέλει ἐστὶ καὶ αὕτη ἡ ἀληθὴς καὶ μόνη θεοσέβεια ἐστὶ καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ καλὸν καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια· ἔδει τοῦτο οὕτω αἰεὶ εἶναι, ἵνα μὴ τὸ καλὸν καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐπιγένηται καὶ ἐκ προσθήκης συνίσταται τὸ τῆς θεολογίας πλήρωμα. Ἐδει οὖν τοῦτο αἰδίως εἶναι· εἰ δὲ μὴ αἰδίως ἦν, ἔδει μὴδὲ νῦν οὕτως αὐτὴν εἶναι, ἀλλ' οὕτως εἶναι, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑμεῖς αὐτὴν ὑποτίθεσθε, ἵνα μὴδὲ νῦν Τριάς ᾖ. ὅτι οὐκ ἂν ἀνάσχοιτό τις χριστιανῶν τῶν τοιοῦτων ἀφρεσι-  
κῶν. Ἑλλήνων γὰρ ἴδια ταῦτα, ὥστε γεννητὴν εἰσάγειν Τριάδα, καὶ τῆς γενητοῦς αὐτὴν συνεξιστάζειν. τῶν γὰρ γεννητῶν ἐστὶν ἑλλείψεις καὶ προσθήκας δέχασθαι· χριστιανῶν δὲ ἡ πίστις ἀτρεστοῦ καὶ τέλει καὶ αἰεὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχουσιν τὴν μακαρίαν οἶδε Τριάδα, καὶ οὐτε πλέον τι τῇ Τριάδι προστίθουσιν, οὐτε ἐνδεῶς ποτε ταύτην γεγενῆσθαι λογίζεται... διὸ καὶ ἀμικρῇ μὲν αὐτὴν γινώσκει τῶν γεννητῶν, ἀδιαίρετον δὲ τὴν ἐνότητα τῆς θεότητος αὐτῆς φυλάττουσα προσκυνεῖ."
7. The Mystical Theology ... op. cit., p. 46.
8. Carm. I, 1 P.G. 37, 1074 A, vers. 658 - 659
9. Carm. I, 1 P.G. 37, 413, vers. 60.
10. The Mystical Theology ... op. cit. p. 44 sq



11. Or. 40, 41 P.G. 36, 417B. "Οὐ φθάνω τὸ ἐν νοῆσαι, καὶ τοῖς τρισὶ περιλάμπομαι· οὐ φθάνω τὰ τρία διελεῖν, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἐν ἀναφέρομαι. Ὅταν ἐν τι τῶν τριῶν φαντασθῶ, τοῦτο νομίζω τὸ πᾶν, καὶ τὴν ὄψιν πεπλήρωμαι, καὶ τὸ πλεον διέφυγεν. Οὐκ ἔχω τὸ μέγεθος τούτου καταλαβεῖν, ἵνα δῶ τὸ πλεον τῷ λειπομένῳ."
12. Cf. DIDYMUS ALEX. De Trin. 2,1 P.G. 39, 448C.
13. Or. 34.3 P.G. 609B
14. This is a common locus in Gregorian Corpus. Cf. Or. 18.16, P.G. 35, 1005A. "οἱ γὰρ ἑκάστον ἀκατάληπτον καὶ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐπίνοιαν, πῶς ἐνταῦθα τὸ ὑπεραῖρον ἢ νοηθῆσεται ἢ δογματισθῆσεται";, Or. 6.22 P.G. 35, 752A, Or. 23.11 P.G. 35, 1161C.
15. Cf. ST. MAXIMUS, Schol. in De Div. Nom. of AREOPAGETICA: "Ἀπολύτως. τουτέστιν οὐ κατὰ τι μὲν, κατὰ τι δὲ οὐ, ἢ ὡς πρὸς τι ἕτερον, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἀπλὴν ἐννοιαν, τουτέστι κυρίως". P.G. 4, 404C.
16. Cf. Or. 18.16 P.G. 35, 1005B;
17. P.G. 91, 1185BC.
18. B. N. TATAKES, Μελετήματα χριστιανικῆς φιλοσοφίας, Athens 1967, p. 149.
19. ELIAS CRET., Schol. P.G. 36, 800AB.
20. PLAT. Theaet. 204A-205C.
21. PLOT. Enn. 1, 3.4.13ff.
22. PROCLUS, Στοιχείωσις θεολογικὴ, prop. 67. An opposite view is given by ST. JO. DAM. De Fid. Orth. 1.13 P.G. 94, 832C. "ἵστέον δὲ ὅτι τὸ θεῖον ἀμερές ἐστίν, ὅλον ὁλικῶς πανταχοῦ ὂν καὶ οὐ μέρος ἐν μέρει σωματικῶς διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ' ὅλον ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ ὅλον ὑπὲρ πᾶν".
23. Or. 34.8 P.G. 36, 249A.
24. PROCLUS, Στοιχείωσις θεολ. prop. 67.
25. Cf. Epist. 178 P.G. 37, 293AB.

26. Cf. Or. 23.11 P.G. 35, 1164B. "Ὅθεν γὰρ ἐφινεῖται τι τῶν κτιστῶν καὶ δούλων καὶ μετεχόντων καὶ περιγραπτῶν τῆς ἀκτίστου καὶ δεσποτικῆς καὶ μεταληπτῆς καὶ ἀπείρου φύσεως. τὰ μὲν γὰρ πάντα πόρρω, τὰ δὲ ποσῶς ὀλνσιάζοντα καὶ ὀλνσιάζοντα καὶ τοῦτο οὐ φύσει, ἀλλὰ μεταλήψει... ἀλλὰ μὴ φύσει τὰ δεσποῖα γοῦ ταπεινότητι".
  27. The word "ἰδιότης" is equal to hypostasis or persona, which means the specific mode of the substance of a thing. Cf. A. HARNACK, History of Dogma, op. cit., vol. IV, p. 86. The word "φύσις" maintained itself alongside of "οὐσία", and in the same way "ἰδιότης" was used along with "ὑπόστασις", whereas in Athanasius the terms "οὐσία" and "ὑπόστασις" were almost identical in meaning. See also H. DÜRRIE, Die Epiphanias - Prediat des Gregor von Nazianz (hom. 39) und Ihre Geistesgeschichtliche Bedeutung", In KYRIAKON, vol. 1, p. 413. Cf. Or. 39.11, P.G. 36, 345C "κατὰ τὰς ἰδιότητας, εἴτουν ὑποστάσεις" and ST. CYRIL of JER. Catech. 11.
  28. Or. 23.16 P.G. 35, 1005A.
  29. Cf. ST. GREGORY OF NYSS. Hom. 1, 1 in Jo. (p. 93.9) "Ὁ μόνος, ὅς ἐαυτοῦ γινώσκόμενος τρισυπόστατος θεὸς καὶ μοναδικός", ed. K. HANSMANN, Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte 16<sup>4-5</sup>, Paderborn 1934.
  30. Epist. 178 P.G. 37, 293A.
  31. Or. 25.15 P.G. 35, 1220B.
  32. Or. 40.41 P.G. 36, 417B.
  33. Or. 23.11 P.G. 35, 1164A.
  34. Or. 25.16 P.G. 34, 1221AB.
  35. Cf. BASILIUS MINIMUS' particular comment on the phrase "ἵνα καὶ τοῦτο δεῖκόν ἐκώσῃ τὸ μοναδικόν", P.G. 36, 1177B.
  36. De Decr. P.G. 25, 464 A sq. Cf. also Epist. I Ad Serap. P.G. 26, 568C-569A "τοῦ μὲν γὰρ πατρὸς... ἄλλος θεὸς οὐ γέγονεν· υἱὸς δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος· μονογενὴς γὰρ ἔστι· διὸ καὶ μόνος καὶ εἰς ὁ πατήρ, μόνου καὶ ἑνὸς υἱοῦ πατήρ ἔστι· καὶ ἐπὶ μόνου τῆς θεότητος τὸ πατήρ καὶ τὸ υἱὸς ἔστι· καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ἔστι· τῶν μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώπων εἰς πατήρ λέγεται τις, ἀλλ' ἐτέρου γέγονεν υἱός.
- Cf. also ST. JO. DAM. De Fid. Orth. 1.8 P.G. 94, 816C, ST. SOPHRONIUS HIER. Ort. In Annunt. P.G. 87, 3221BC and ST. GREGORY PAL. Orat. I<sup>90</sup> τί οὐκ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἀγαθὸν μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπιπορεύεται τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγίον". ed. P. CHRESTOU, vol. I, p. 49.

37. Cf. Or. 40.43 P.G. 36, 420 c sq. ST. GREGORY feels responsible for defending his congregation from any accusation of heresy.
38. Or. 25.17 P.G. 35, 1221D-1224A. Cf. BASIL MIN. Schol. P.G. 36, 1177C.
39. De Decr. Nic. 11 P.G. 25, 436A.
40. Ib. "ὁ δὲ θεός, ἀμερῆς ὢν, ἀμερίστως ἐστὶ καὶ ἀπαθὴς τοῦ ὕβους πατρὸς".
41. Ib.
42. Cf. ST. MAX. Myst. P.G. 97, 701B. "ὅτι ἡς μετ' εὐχὰς τοῦ θεοῦ Πατέρα, μυστικὸν τε χρίτι καὶ μόνον ἔχουσα, πρὸς τὸ ἐν τῆς αὐτοῦ κρυφιοῦτος κατ' ἐκστάσιν πάντων συν-σχεδίασται". Cf. also ST. GREGORY PAL. Or. I, "ὅτι οὐκ καὶ ἐν τοῦ υἱοῦ ἀλλ' ἐν μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς ἐμ-πορεύεται τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον" ed. P. CHRESTOU, vol. I, p. 49-51. He repeats almost verbatim ST. GREGORY's passage Or. 31.14 P.G. 36, 148D sq. "ἡμῖν εἷς θεός, ὅτι μία θεότης καὶ πρὸς ἐν τὰ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀναφορὰν ἔχει, καὶ τρία πρὸς στεύνται".
43. Eccl. Hist. 1.5 P.G. 67, 41AB. Cf. Or. 42.30 P.G. 36, 537A.
44. Cf. J. KARMIRIS, Τὰ Δογματικὰ καὶ Συμβολικὰ Μνημεῖα, op. cit., p. 72 and B. OTIS, "Gregory of Nyssa and the Cappadocian conception of time", in SP 14 (1976) p. 334, not. 5 "Arius shocked Alexander and the 'orthodox' Egyptians not by denying the agnetic character of Christ but by denying the 'ἀειγενής' or eternal creation of Christ".
45. Or. 20.6 P.G. 35, 1072B.
46. Clement's use of Aristotle, op. cit., p. 29-30. Cf.
47. Ib. p. 33. S. R. LILLA thinks that CLEMENT's origin about the theory of virtue comes from Middle-Platonism rather than from ARISTOTLE directly. Clement of Alexandria (thesis), Oxford 1971, p. 64-65.
48. Cf. Nombr. 20.17 and Prov. 4.27. Also Or. 2.34 P.G. 35, 441c, Or. 22.14 P.G. 35, 1148A.
49. A. A. STEPHENSON, "St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Trinitarian Theology". In S.P. 11 (1972) p. 237-238. Cf. also ST. JO. DAM. De Imag. 2.3 P.G. 94, 1285A and Ib. 3 P.G. 94, 1317C.

50. D. G. TSAMES, Ἡ περὶ Μεσότητος διδασκαλία Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου, In KLERONOMIA, I (1969) pp. 275-283. Cf. also N. CH. BOUKES, Ἡ θεολογία κατὰ Γρηγόριον τὸν Ναζιανζηνόν. Θεολογικὸν Συμπόσιον. Tomus in honour of Prof. P. K. CHRESTOU, Thessaloniki 1967, pp. 146, 154-156. J. T. CUMMING, Lexical Notes on St. Gregory Nazianzen, In GRBS 9 (1968) pp. 186-188. "Towards a Critical Edition of the Carmen de Vita Sua of St. Gregory Nazianzen, In S.P. 7 (1966), pp. 52-59. J. SZUMUSIAK, Grégoire Le Théologien, disciple d'Athanase, In Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie, ed. CH. KANNENGEISSER, Paris 1973, pp. 23-25. T. SPIDLIK, La theoria et la praxis chez Gregoire de Nazianze, In S.P. 14 (1976) p. 362 and B. OTIS, The Throne and the Mountain, an Essay on St. Gregory Nazianzus, In C.J. 56 (1967), p. 148.
  
51. J. A. DORNER, The Person of Christ, vol. 2, 1, op. cit., p. 229.
  
52. Or. 20.6 P.G. 35, 1072B. "καὶ τὴν φάβην συναίρεσιν παραιτούμενοι, καὶ τὴν ἀτοπωτέραν διαίρεσιν". Cf. a series of passages where the same theme occurs: Or. 43.30 P.G. 36, 537A "τὴν ἀθέον σαβέλλου συναίρεσιν ἀσεβεστέρα διαίρεσει καὶ κατὰ τομῇ λύνοντες· ἢν ἄρειος νοσήσας ὁ τῆς μανίας ἐπιωνυμῶς Or. 42.16 P.G. 36, 476C. "Ὅντε τῷ ἐνὶ σαβέλλου κατὰ τῶν τριῶν, καὶ συναίρεσει κακῇ τὰν διαίρεσιν λύνοντες· ὅντε τοῖς τρισὶν ἄρειανίζοντες κατὰ τοῦ ἐνός, καὶ πονηρᾷ διαίρεσει τὸ ἐν ἀνατρέποντες". Or. 25.16 P.G. 35, 1220C. "Μήτε ἀρχὰς τρεῖς, ἵνα μὴ ἐχθρὸν ᾖ τὸ πνεῦμα· μήτε μίαν μόνον, ἵνα μὴ ἐχθρὸν ᾖ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ φθονεράν καὶ ἀδύνατον". Or. 31.30 P.G. 36, 168D-169A. "ἵνα μὴ εἰς ἀσέβειαν, καὶ σαβέλλως συνάψαι, καὶ ἄρειανως διασπῆσθαι, τὸ μὲν τῷ προσώπῳ, τὸ δὲ ταῖς ἐνέσεσιν". Cf. also Or. 33.16 P.G. 36, 233D. Or. 34.8 P.G. 36, 249A. Or. 37.2 P.G. 36, 308A. Or. 38.8 P.G. 36, 320B. Or. 18.16 P.G. 35, 1005A, Or. 20.5 P.G. 35, 1072A, Or. 21.13 P.G. 35, 1124-1125AB. It seems that a similar expression belongs to ST. ATHANASIUS as well. Cf. Epist. I ad Serap. P.G. 26, 596B. "καὶ ὅντε ἐλάττω τῶν φρονεῖ τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἵνα μὴ εἰς τοὺς νῦν κατὰ καὶ ἄλλαν ἰουδαίους καὶ εἰς σαβέλλιον ἐμπέσῃ· ὅντε πλεονεκτοῦ ἐπινοεῖ, ἵνα μὴ εἰς τὴν ἐκλήγαν πολλοθεότητα ἐκλυθεῖ". Cf. H. DÜRRIE, Die Epiphaniast-Predigt des Gregor von Nazianz (Hom. 39) und ihre Geistesgeschichtliche Bedeutung, In KYRIAKON, vol. 1, p. 414-p. 414-415.
  
53. Cf. also J. MOSSAY, Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 20-23, SC. 270, Paris 1980, p. 69, not. 3.

54. Or. 2.37 P.G. 36, 445A.
55. Cf. Frag. Orph. 161(E. ABEL) Εἰς Ζεὺς, εἰς αἰθέρος, εἰς  
ἄλλος, εἰς Διόνυσος, εἰς θεός ἐν πάντεσι. τί σοι δίχα ταῦτα  
ἀγορεύω;  
Or. 31.16 P.G. 36, 149C-152A,  
and Addit. ad Eliae Comm. "τοὺς δὲ φανκτας πλὴν ὁρίων δι-  
 και τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀγνοεῖν, οἳ εἰς μὲν οὗτος, καὶ πλῆθυντικῶς  
 λέγεται, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ὁριστικοῖς ποιήμασιν εἰσάγεται μετὰ τῶν  
 ἄλλων θεῶν καὶ φάνης οὗτος..."
56. "The fourth century", In Sobornost 1978, ser. 7, no. 6, p. 435.
57. "The origins of Arianism" in JTHS 9 (1958) p. 104-105.
58. Cf. also Or. 21.13 P.G. 35, 1096B.
59. Or. 31.13 P.G. 36, 148BC.
60. Or. 31.12 P.G. 36, 148A.
61. Or. 31.16 P.G. 36, 149C-152A.
62. Or. 31.15 P.G. 36, 149B.
63. Ib.
64. Schol. in Or. 31 P.G. 36, 831A. Cf. also Or. 26.2 P.G. 35,  
936D. Or. 29.13 P.G. 36, 92A.
65. P.G. 150, 1196A. Cf. A. RADOVIC, The mystery of the Holy  
Trinity according to St. Gregory Palamas (thesis),  
Thessaloniki 1973, p. 117.
66. Or. 20.6 P.G. 35, 1072B. ST. ATHANASIUS also had foreseen a  
 kind of pagan theogonies in SABELLIUS' teaching. Epist. 4 ad  
Serap. P.G. 26, 645B.
67. Dialog. Theophanes 20, ed. P. CHRESTOU, vol. 2, p. 245.
68. Or. 20.6 P.G. 36, 1073A. Cf. ST. CYRIL of ALEX. Schol. In  
Luc. 5.18 P.G. 72, 536D-537A. In Ton. 6.64 P.G. 73, 605A.  
Ib. 14.16, 17 P.G. 74, 257B-D. Ib. 25-26 P.G. 74, 301C.  
Ad Rom. 6.3 P.G. 74, 792C. Also ST. JO. DAM. De Fid. Orth.  
1.8 P.G. 94, 829A.
69. Or. 31.29 P.G. 36, 165B. Later ST. JO. DAM. De Fid. Orth.  
4.5 P.G. 94, 1105C-1108A defends the incarnation only of the  
 Son using the same argumentation.



70. Or. 39.12 P.G. 36, 348C. Cf. ST. JO. DAM. De Trin. P.G. 95, 12A.
71. Cf. DIDYMUS ALEX., De Trin. 2.1 P.G. 39, 449A.
72. Or. 25.16 P.G. 35, 1221B. Cf. ST. ATHANASIUS, Epist. 4 ad Serap. P.G. 26, 645C and ST. JO. DAM. De Fid. Orth. 1 P.G. 94, 792C. As P. CHRESTOU pointed out, the heretics followed the schema: "ἀγέννητος, γεννητός, κτιστός". "L'enseignement de Saint Basile sur le Saint-Esprit", In Θεολογικά Μελετήματα, Thessaloniki 1975, p. 165.
73. Or. 20.7 P.G. 35, 1073A.
74. Or. 1.7 P.G. 35, 401A. Or. 31.33 P.G. 36, 172B.
75. Ib.
76. Or. 23.20 P.G. 35, 1161BC. "Τριάς δέ, οὐ πραγμάτων ἀήλων ἀπαρί-  
θμοις ᾧ τὶ κωλύει, καὶ δεκάδα, καὶ ἑκατοντάδα, καὶ μυριάδα ὀνομάζειν  
μετὰ τοσούτων συντιθεμένων; πολλὰ γὰρ τὰ ἀριθμοῦμενα, καὶ πλείω τοῦ-  
των, ἀλλ' ἴσων καὶ δημοσίων σύλληψις, ἐνόησας τῆς προσήγορίας τὰ ἡνωμένα  
ἐν φύσεως, καὶ οὐκ ἐνώσης συνεδασθῆναι ἀριθμῶ λυομένω  
τὰ μὴ λυόμενα". Cf. Or. 43.30 P.G. 36, 537AB. "Ἀλλὰ μίαν μὲν δόξαν πατρὸς δινώσκομεν, τὴν  
κοινομένην τοῦ μονογενοῦς· μίαν δὲ υἱοῦ, τὴν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύ-  
ματος". Or. 40.43 P.G. 36, 420B. "οὐδὲν γὰρ τῶν ὁμο-  
ονσίων τῇ οὐσίᾳ μᾶζον ἢ ἑλάττω".
77. L'Esprit Saint dans la tradition d'orthodoxe, op. cit., p. 39.  
Cf. H. DÜRRIE, Die Epiphanias ... op. cit., p. 422.
78. Cf. Or. 23.20 P.G. 35, 1161BC. Also J. MCINTYRE, "The Holy Spirit in Greek Patristic thought" In SJTH 7 (1954), p. 360.  
G. FLOROVSKY, The Function of Tradition of the Ancient Church, In GOTHR 9 (1963), p. 193; also The Fourth Century, In Sobornost 1978, ser. 7, no. 6, p. 445. M. ORPHANOS, Ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα εἰς τὴν τριαδολογίαν τοῦ Μ. Βασίλειου, (thesis), Athens 1976, p. 116, not. 5.
79. Or. 23.11 P.G. 35, 1161C.
80. Or. 39.11 P.G. 36, 345C. "κατὰ τὸν τῆς οὐσίας λόγον, αἶψου θεότητος".
81. J. A. DORNER, op. cit., vol. 2, div. 1, p. 249. Cf. Or. 20.11 P.G. 35, 1077C. "Ἀνούεις γεννησιν; τὸ πῶς μὴ περιεργά-  
ζου. Ἀνούεις ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα προῖδεν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς; τὸ ὅ-

πως μὴ πολυπραγμονεῖ ". Cf. also DIDYMUS ALEX. De Trin. 2.1 P.G. 39, 448C. " τῷ μὲν ὁμοουσίου τῆς τριάδος μὴ ἀπιστοῦντες, τρόπον δὲ καὶ διαφορὰν γεννήσεως καὶ ἐκπορεύσεως οὐ ζητοῦντες ". ST. JO. DAM. De Fid. Orth. 1.8 P.G. 94, 824A. Cf. M. E. HUSSEY, The Theology of the Holy Spirit in the writings of St. Gregory of Nazianzus, In DIAKONIA, 14.3 (1979), p. 229. Also P. EUDOKIMOV, L'Esprit Saint dans la tradition orthodoxe, op. cit., p. 92.

82. See E. ABEL, op. cit., Frag. 72, p. 181.
83. Or. 39.11 P.G. 36, 345D. Cf. ST. JO. DAM. De Fid. Orth. 1.8 P.G. 94, 829B.
84. I Cor. 8.6.
85. Or. 39.12 P.G. 36, 348A.
86. Or. 20.6 P.G. 35, 1072B. Cf. also Or. 2.47 P.G. 35, 445A.
87. De Spir. Sanct. 2 P.G. 32, 73D.
88. P.G. 36, 832C-833A. " τοῦ γὰρ Πλάτωνος ἐξ τὰ τῶν ὄντων αἰτία ἀπορρηναμένου ποιητικόν, παραδειγματικόν, ὀργανικόν, ὄλικόν, εἰδικόν, τελικόν. καὶ τῷ μὲν ποιητικῷ τὸ ἐξ οὗ ἀφορίσαντος, τῷ δὲ παραδειγματικῷ τὸ καθ' οὗ, τῷ δὲ ὀργανικῷ τὸ δι' οὗ, τῷ δὲ τελικῷ τὸ εἰς ὃ καὶ τοῦ ἀριστοτέλους αὐδῆς, ὡς τὸ παραδειγματικόν καὶ τὸ ὀργανικόν ἀθετήσαντος, τῷ μὲν ποιητικῷ τὸ ἐφ' οὗ προσνέμαντος, τῷ δὲ εἰδικῷ τὸ ἐν ᾧ ἐναντίας πλάτωνι τῷ ὄλικῷ τὸ ἐξ οὗ, τῷ δὲ τελικῷ τὸ εἰς ὃ ἐντεῦθεν τὴν μὲν ἐξ οὗ τῷ πατρὶ ἐδίδουσαν, ἢ ὡς αἰτίαν τε καὶ τεχνίτη τῶν ὄντων, τὴν δὲ δι' οὗ τῷ νοεῷ, ὡς ὀργάνῳ δημιουργικῷ καὶ ἐργασίῳ τεχνικῷ, τὴν δὲ ἐν ᾧ τῷ ἁλίῳ πνεύματι, ὡς τόπῳ ἢ χρόνῳ, καίτοιγε οὐ παχίως αἰετῆς παρατηρήσεως ταύτης παρὰ τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ ἐνυλάττομένης ".
89. PHILO, Περὶ τῶν Χερουβίμ 3.5 (KOHN-WENDLAND) 1, p. 200, 10. Νόμων ἐπερὶ τῶν ἀλληγορίας 96 (Ib.) 1, p. 134, 18-19. Cf. also M. A. ORPHANOS, Ὁ νοῦς καὶ τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα... op. cit., p. 141. H. A. WOLFSON, "Philosophical implications of Arianism and Apollinarianism" in DOP 12 (1958) p. , not. 5. E. A. CLARK, Clement's use of Aristotle, op. cit., p. 74-75.
90. See R. R. RUEETHER, Gregory of Nazianzus, Oxford 1969, p. 179. She repeats verbatim P. GALLAY's chronology in his thesis, La vie de S. Gregoire de Nazianze, Paris 1943, pp. 252-253.



91. Epist. 199 P.G. 37, 716C. Cf. ST. PAPADOPOULOS, Μεγάλου Βασιλείου Βιογραφικὸν ἑμπύημα, In Church and Theology, Ecclesiastical and Theological Review of the Archbishopric of Thyateira and Great Britain, London 1980, vol. I, p. 76.
92. Or. 39.12 P.G. 36, 348A.
93. P.G. 32, 133A sq.
94. Or. 31.18 P.G. 36, 152D-153A.
95. "διωρισμένη", De Spir. Sanct. 17 P.G. 32, 148C
96. Ib. 18 P.G. 32, 148D. ST. BASIL summarizes the orthodox belief in the knowledge of the names of God. "Μάλιστα μὲν διὲρ ἀριθμὸν ἔστω τὰ ἀνέγκτα".
97. Or. 31.17 P.G. 36, 152B.
98. The purpose of this oration is purely dogmatic rather than apologetic.
99. Or. 42.15 P.G. 36, 476A.
100. Ib. 476B.
101. Ib.
102. Or. 31.16 P.G. 36, 152B.
103. Cf. DIDYMUS ALEX. De Trin. 2.6 P.G. 39, 520B. "ὅτι δὲ τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ λόγον, καὶ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἁγίου πνεύματος, πᾶσα ἐνέργεια καὶ δυνάμεις, δημιουργικὴ τε ἀγαθὴ τε καὶ τελεία καὶ κοινὴ αὐτῶν ὑπάρχει, ἀνδρεται δὲ ὅλα εἰς τὸν ἕνα, ἕξ οὗ καὶ σὺν τῷ ἀφρόδως ἐξεφάνησαν ἀμακάρια ὑποστάσεις αὗται".
104. Or. 31.17 P.G. 36, 152BC. "τὰ δμοσύσια συναριθμεῖται, φησὶ συν-ἀριθμοῖν λέγων τὴν εἰς ἀριθμὸν ἕνα συναίρεσιν· οὐ συναριθμεῖται δὲ τὰ μὴ δμοσύσια· ὥστε ὑμεῖς μὲν οὐ φεύξεσθε τὸ λέγειν τρεῖς θεοὺς κατὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦτον· ἡμῖν δὲ οὐδὲ εἰς κίνδυνος· οὐ γὰρ δμοσύσια λέγομεν".
105. Or. 31.18 P.G. 36, 152C.
106. Prov. 30, 29-31.
107. Exod. 37, 7. Or. 31.18 P.G. 36, 153A.

108. Matth. 6, 24.
109. Or. 31.19 P.G. 36, 153B. This argumentation is reminiscent of Eunomius' well known principle by which different appellations must indicate a difference in substance. Cf. D. L. BALAS, The unity of human nature in Basil's and Gregory of Nyssa's polemics against Eunomius, In SP 14 (1976), p. 276.
110. Ib.
111. Ib.
112. Ib. 153C.
113. MASON, op. cit., p. 168, not. 3 and 6 and NPNF, p. 323.
114. De Spir. Sanct. 17 P.G. 32, 144D
115. Ib.
116. Or. 31.15 P.G. 36, 149B. Cf. ST. JO. DAM. De Fid. Orth. 1.8 P.G. 94, 828A-D.
117. Or. 20.6 P.G. 35, 1972B. Cf. also Or. 2, 47 P.G. 35, 445A.
118. ST. GREGORY overthrows his opponents' principle by their means themselves: "Ἐπεὶ καὶ οἱ Πέτρος, καὶ Παῦλος, καὶ Ἰωάννης, οὐ τρεῖς, οὐδὲ δμοῦσιν, ἕως ἄν μή τρεῖς Πέτροι, καὶ τρεῖς Παῦλοι, καὶ Ἰωάννοι τοσοῦτοι λέγονται", Or. 31.19, P.G. 36, 153B.
119. About the importance of this passage, see H. ALFORD, The Greek Testament, Cambridge 1880, vol. 4, p. 499 sq. Cf. also the Doxastikon of Psalms on 25 of December, poem by ANATOLIUS:
 

" Ἀῖμα, καὶ πῦρ, καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ,  
 τέρατα ᾧς, ἃ προείδεν Ἰωήλ [2.29 sq]  
 ἄῖμα τὴν σαρκοῦσιν· πῦρ, τὴν θεότητα·  
 ἀτμίδα δὲ καπνοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,  
 τὸ ἐπελθὼν τῇ Παρθένῳ, καὶ νόμον εὐωδίδωσαν.  
 Μέγα τὸ μυστήριον τῆς σῆς ἑνανθρωπήσεως,  
 Κύριε, δόξα σοι".
120. It is a broad hint about the insistence on an onesided and grammatical interpretation of the biblical texts. "πρῶτον μὲν, ὅταν τὰ μὴ δμοῦσια συναριθμῆται, τετόλμηκεν, ὁ τοῖς δμοῦσιν οὐδὲν οὐκ εἰδώς. (τίς γὰρ ἂν εἴποι τὰντα μίας οὐσίας;) Δεύτερον δέ, ὅτι μὴ καταλλήλως ἔχων ἀπὸ τῆς οὐσίας τὰ τρεῖς ἄρρενικῶς προείπεν, τὰ τρία οὐδετέρως ἐπὶ τῆς κατὰ τοὺς σοὺς, καὶ τῆς

σῆς γραμματικῆς ὁρους καὶ νόμους ". Or. 31,19 P.G. 36, 153C.

121. Ib. 156A.

122. Or. 31.20 P.G. 36, 156A.

123. Ib. 156AB.

124. Or. 39.12 P.G. 36, 348A.

125. De Spir. Sanct. 17 P.G. 32, 144Bc. "Τὴν δὲ ὑπαριθμήσιν ὅτι καὶ λέγουσι... ὅτι μὲν γὰρ ἔκ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου σοφίας καὶ αὐτὴ ἡμῖν ἐπεισήχθη, παντὶ γνωρίμον ", and "Ἀλλὰ τὰ ἑλληνικὰ νοσοῦντες οἰοῦνται τὰ κατὰ βαθμὸν ἀξιωματίων ἢ κατὰ οὐσίας ὅ γε σὶν ὑποβαίνοντα ταῦτα προσήκειν ὑπαριθμεῖσθαι". Cf. also "Ὅς δὲ τὴν ὑπαριθμήσιν ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ καὶ δευτέρῳ καὶ τρίτῳ λέγουσιν τιθέμενοι γνωρίζεσθωσαν τὸ πολὺθεν τῆς ἑλληνικῆς σολάνης τῇ ἀχραντῇ θεολογίᾳ τῶν χριστιανῶν ἐπεισάχοντες. Ἐἰς οὖν δὲν γὰρ ἕτερον φέρει τῆς ὑπαριθμήσεως τὸ κακούρημα, ἢ ὡς πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον θεὸν καὶ τρίτον ὁμολογεῖν ". Ib. 17 P.G. 32, 144Bc. Cf. M. ORPHANOS, Ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ... op. cit., p. 151, not. 2.

126. Or. 31.20 P.G. 36, 156BC.

127. It is noteworthy to state that very much later ST. GREGORY PALAMAS based upon this point directly the procession of the Holy Spirit and only from the Father; he repeats almost verbatim ST. GREGORY's conclusions and defends the orthodox belief from the view of a first, second and third God, thus: "Ἀμφοτέραις δὲ ἡμεῖς μετὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀντερούντες (sc. τὸ ὑπαριθμεῖν οἱ τὸ προαριθμεῖν) λέγοντες, οὐκ ἐν τῇ τάξει τῶν ὀνομάτων ὡς οὗτοι, κείναι τὰ πράγματα. Εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο, τί πωλεῖ κατὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγον τῆς συναριθμήσεως καὶ προαριθμήσεως ἐπαλαττομένης παρὰ τῇ θεᾷ γραφῇ, ποτε μὲν γεννᾶν τε καὶ προβάλλειν, ποτε δὲ τὰ αὐτὰ γεννᾶσθαι τε καὶ προβάλλεσθαι; ... οὐδὲ γὰρ πρῶτον μὲν θεὸν τὸν πατέρα σέβομεν, δεύτερον δὲ τὸν υἱόν, τρίτον δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἔνθα δὲ τὸ δεύτερον μετὰ τὸ πρῶτον λέγωμεν καὶ μετ' αὐτὸ τὸ τρίτον, ὑπὸ τὰ ζῖν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀχόντες τὰ ὑπεράνω τάξεως".

Oratio 1, about the Procession of the Holy Spirit only from the Father but not at all from the Son, ed. P. CHRESTOU, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 60-61, §32.

128. Or. 34.15, P.G. 35, 256A.

129. Or. 28.1 P.G. 36, 25D-28A. "φέρε, τοῖς τῆς θεολογίας ἤδη προσ-  
βῶμεν λόγοις προστησάμενοι τοῦ λόγου τὸν πατέρα, καὶ τὸν υἱόν,  
καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, περὶ ὧν ὁ λόγος, ὥστε τὸν μὲν εὐδοκεῖν, τῷ  
δὲ συνεργεῖν, τὸ δὲ ἁμπνεῖν· μαχρόν δὲ μίαν θεότης μίας θεότητος  
γενέσθαι τὴν ἑλαμψιν ἐνικῶς διαιρουμένην, καὶ συναπτομένην  
διαιρετῶς, ὃ καὶ παραδόντων".
130. I Cor. 12, 11.
131. Rom. 8, 959.
132. Epist. I ad Serap. P.G. 26, 565AB. Cf. ST. JO. DAM. De Fid.  
Orth. 1.8 P.G. 94, 812A and Ib. 3.10 P.G. 94, 7020AB.
133. "A Study of Cappadocian and Augustinian Trinitarian Methodology",  
in ATHR 47 (1965), p. 269, not. 1.
134. Or. 28.1 P.G. 36, 25D-28A.
135. Cf. ST. JO. DAM. Schol. in Rom. P.G. 95, 537A.
136. Cf. J. KARMİRES, "Τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐντὶ ἑκκλησιᾶς". In  
EKKL 46 (1969), no. 25, p. 552. Also "Ἡ ἑκκλησιολογία τῶν  
τρίων ἱεραρχῶν", Athens 1962, pp. 63-74. G. DRAGAS,  
Holy Spirit and Tradition: The Writings of ST. ATHANASIUS,  
In SOBORNOST 1979, vol. 1, no. 1, p. 51. P. EUDOKIMOV points  
out this inner motion when he describes the Icon of the Holy  
Trinity by ANDREAS ROUVLIOV, which now belongs to the museum  
of Moscow. L'Orthodoxie (thesis), trans in Greek by  
A. T. MOURTZOPOULOS, Salonica 1972, p. 314 sq.
137. Epist. I. ad Serap. P.G. 26, 600C. Cf. Epist. III ad Serap.  
P.G. 26, 633B. "τοῦ γὰρ πνεύματος μετέχοντες, ἐχομέν τὴν  
τοῦ λόγου χάριν, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀγάπην",  
the communication, grace and love in reverse order.
138. Epist. III ad Serap. P.G. 26, 633C. "Ὅστω δὲ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος  
γενομένου ἐν ἡμῖν, ἐλεύσεται ὁ υἱός, καὶ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ μόνῃ ποιήσουσιν ἐν  
ἡμῖν. Ἀδιαίρετος γὰρ ἡ τριάς, καὶ μία ταύτης ἡ θεότης· καὶ εἷς θεός ἐπὶ πάν-  
των καὶ διὰ πάντων, καὶ ἐν πᾶσι". Cf. J. MCINTYRE, The Holy Spirit  
in Greek Patristic Thought, in SJTH 7 (1954), p. 355 sq.
139. Or. 6.22 P.G. 35, 749B. Cf. also M. E. HUSSEY, The Theology  
of the Holy Spirit. In the writings of St. Gregory of  
Nazianzus, op. cit., p. 231.

140. De Spir. Sanct. 18 P.G. 32, 153B. "Ἡ τοίνυν ὁδὸς τῆς θεογνωσίας ἐστὶν ἀπὸ ἑνὸς Πνεύματος, διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Υἱοῦ, ἐπὶ τὸν ἕνα Πατέρα. Καὶ ἀνάπαλιν, ἡ φωνικὴ ἀραδότης, καὶ ὁ κατὰ φύσιν ἀγιασμός, καὶ τὸ βασιλικὸν ἀζώμα, ἢ πατρός, διὰ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς, ἐπὶ τὸ πνεῦμα διήκει. Οὕτω καὶ αἱ ὑποστάσεις ὁμολογοῦνται, καὶ τὸ ἐν σφίσι δόγμα τῆς μοναρχίας οὐ διαπίπτει". Cf. ST. GREGORY of NYSS. De Spir. Sanct. III.1, 98, 25. Cf. also T. R. MARTLAND, A Study of Cappadocian and Augustinian Trinitarian Methodology, In ATHR 47 (1965), p. 253.
141. B. BOBRINSKŪY, Βασίλειος ὁ Μέγας καὶ ἡ ἐμβάθυνσις τῆς θεολογίας τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, κατὰ τὸν 4<sup>ον</sup> αἰῶνα, In "Ὁρθόδοξος Μαρτυρία καὶ ἑκένψις", 23 (1980), p. 12-13. Cf. also E. BAILLEUX, Le Personalism Trinitaire des Peres Grecs, In MSR, 27, p. 1 (1970), pp. 20-25.
142. De Spir. Sanct. 18 P.G. 32, 153B.
143. Or. 31.14 P.G. 36, 148D.
144. Epist. III ad Serap. P.G. 26, 636C. "Ὡς γὰρ αἰὲν ἦν, οὕτως ἐστὶ καὶ νῦν· καὶ ὡς νῦν ἐστὶν, οὕτως αἰὲν ἦν, καὶ ἐστὶν ἡ Τριάς, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ Πατὴρ, καὶ Υἱὸς καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. Καὶ εἰς θεὸς ὁ Πατὴρ ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων, καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσι".
145. Or. 42.15 P.G. 36, 476B.
146. De Trin. 2.5 P.G. 39, 493C sq. Although he refers to ST. PAUL he is more familiar with the Orphic Poetry. Cf. also E. ABEL, op. cit., frag. 4-6 and Corp. Herm. (Testimonia), vol. IV, pp. 54-57 (A. S. FERGUSON). Cf. about the "πατρικὴ ἑνώσις" in Greek tradition, J. M. RIST, "Mysticism and Transcendence in later Neoplatonism" in HERMES 92 (1964), pp. 213-225.
147. Or. 30.6 P.G. 36, 112B.
148. Or. 33.16 P.G. 36, 256A.
149. Cf. an extensive analysis of the point by ST. GREGORY PAL. Or. 2, 35. On the Procession of the Holy Spirit, ed. P. CHRESTOU, vol. I, pp. 109-110. "Ἐπεὶ γὰρ τὸ "μόνος" τοῦτο τὴν ἀκτιστὸν φύσιν ἀντιδιαστέχει τῶν κτιστῶν, ἡ δ' αὖτις φύσις τρισυπόστατος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀμερῶς ἐφ' ἑκάστης τῶν ὑποστάσεων ὅλη θεωρεῖται, ἀφ' ἧς ἀν' αὐτὴν τῶν τριῶν ἐμφάντων ὑποστάσεων καλέσθης, ὅλην λέγεις τὴν τρισυπόστατον φύσιν".

150. Or. 34.9 P.G. 36, 249B. Or. 37.24 P.G. 36, 308C. Or. 33.17 P.G. 36, 236C. The same theme in ST. ATHANASIUS, Epist. 1 ad Serap. P.G. 26, 597C-600A, Epist. 4 ad Serap. P.G. 26, 641B. Cf. ST. JO. DAM. De Imag. 3 P.G. 94, 1325A. As F. J. THOMSON pointed out, ST. ATHANASIUS considered the Arians' baptism invalid, because he was not satisfied with only the "baptismal type" but he claimed orthodox belief in the Holy Trinity. P.G. 26, 237A. "ECONOMY, An examination of the various theories of Economy held within the Orthodox Church, with special reference to the Economical recognition of validity of non-Orthodox sacraments", In JTHS 16 (1965), pp. 400-401. O. CLEMENT, Τρία δοκίμια περί ὁρθοδοξίας, Athens 1962, p. 64.
151. N. AFANASSIEF, Ἡ ἑκκλησία τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, trans. from Russian by N. IOANNIDES, in "Γρηγόριος Παλαμάς", no. 56/635 (1973), pp. 192-193 (Thessaloniki).
152. Or. 33.16 P.G. 35, 236A.
153. This idea is in common among the Greek Fathers. Cf. J. MEYENDORF, Introduction a l'etude de Gregoire Palamas, Paris 1959, p. 291 sq.
154. Cf. DIDYMUS ALEX. De Trin. 2.6 P.G. 39, 508C. "Μήτε δὲ ἀφορίζουσης (sc. τῆς γραφῆς) ἐπὶ τῆς φύσεως τῶν δειλῶν ὑποστάσεων τὸ πρῶτιστά, καὶ τὸ ἑπειτά".
155. G. L. PRESTIGE, God in Patristic thought, London-Toronto 1936, p. 242. Cf. G. DRAGAS, The Eternal Son, In ABBA SALAMA, A Review of the Association of Ethio-Hellenic Studies, Athens 1979, vol. 10, p. 50 sq.
156. Or. 25.17 P.G. 35, 1221D.
157. Ib.
158. V. LOSSKY, The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church, op. cit., p. 66.
159. Or. 2.56 P.G. 35, 465B. Cf. also Or. 29.21 P.G. 36, 104A and ST. JO. DAM. De Fid. Orth. 4.11 P.G. 94, 1128B-1129A. D. F. WINSLOW, The Dynamics of Salvation, op. cit., p. 99. The point will be developed further by ST. GREGORY PAL. for whom the contemplation of the Trinitarian dogma is identified with the mystery of the Cross! "Διὰ τοῦτο σταυροῦ μυστηρίου ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ ποιαύτη θεωρία, σταυροῦσα τῶν ὑπομεινόντων ἑαυτοὺς ἡζιωμένων". Abraham having been initiated into the mystery of the Cross could thus recognize the Triune God in the Three Angels at the Oak of



- Mambre (Gen. 18.1). "Ἰδοὺ δ' εἰς θεοὺς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις,  
καὶ αἱ τρεῖς ἀΰται εἰς κύριος". Hom. 11 P.G. 151, 129C.
160. Carm. I.1 P.G. 37, 414, vers. 72-73. This poem is included in the so called Poemata Arcana ("ἀπορρητὰ"), which are brought the Poemata Dogmatica in P.G. 37, 397-429 and 438-464. D. A. SYKES alleges, with serious argumentation, that the structure of them is independent of the five Theological Orations. "The Poemata Arcana of St. Gregory Nazianzen", in BZ 72 (1979), pp. 6-15, and previously, "The Poemata Arcana of St. Gregory Nazianzen", In THS 21 (1970), pp. 32-42.
161. Ib. vers. 74-75.
162. Ib. vers. 80.
163. Ib. vers. 81.
164. De Spir. Sanct. 18 P.G. 32, 148D. "Δὲ ὀνομάτων ἁγίων τὴν γινώσκοντες τὴν πρὸς σωτηρίαν ἀγωγὴν πλοτεῶς ὡς ἐχάρισατο". Ib. cf. D. F. WINSLOW, Orthodox Baptism - A problem for Gregory of Nazianzus, In SP 14 (1976), pp. 371-374. And Or. 40.45 P.G. 36, 424A. "Βαπτίζω σε μαθητῶν εἰς ὄνομα Πατρός, καὶ υἱοῦ, καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Ὁνομα δὲ κοινὸν τῶν τριῶν ἐν, ἡ ὁμοῦς". And E. ZIGABENUS, On Matth. 28.19 P.G. 129, 764A.
165. "Ὅτι γὰρ κατὰ σύνθεσιν ἀριθμοῦμεν, ἀφ' ἑνὸς εἰς πλῆθος ποιοῦμενοι τὴν παραύξησιν, ἐν καὶ δύο καὶ τρία λέγοντες, οὐδὲ πρῶτον, καὶ δευτέρον καὶ τρίτον. Ἐγὼ δ' αὖ θεὸς πρῶτος, καὶ ἐγὼ μετὰ ταῦτα". Ib. 18 P.G. 32, 149B.
166. Or. 31.31 P.G. 36, 169B. cf. APPENDIX III. p. 279.
167. P. GALLAY, Discours 27-31, S.C. 250, p. 338, not. 1. Cf. P. CHRESTOU, L'enseignement de saint Basile sur le Saint-Esprit, op. cit., p. 167. "Les hypostases ne sont pas première, seconde, troisième, elles sont d'égale valeur et non numérotées - et elles sont désignées par leur nom saint: un seul Dieu, le Père, un seul engendre, le Fil, un seul Saint-Esprit. Toute subordination conduit au polythéisme". Cf. Appendix I.
168. The Mystical Theology ... op. cit., p. 48.
169. Ib., p. 47.
170. Cf. V. LOSSKY, A l'image et à la ressemblance de Dieu, trans. London-Oxford 1975, p. 52.



171. Or. 25.17 P.G. 35, 1221D. The wording is almost perfect; one can notice the crosswise schema:

Μονὰς ἐν Τριᾷδι      ←      Τριάς ἐν Μονᾷδι  
 [παρὰδοξος] διαίρεσις      ↘      [παρὰδοξος] ἔνωσις

Cf. also 33.16 P.G. 36, 236A and Or. 42.16 P.G. 36, 477A and ST. JO. DAM. De Fid. Orth. 1.8 P.G. 94, 825B-828A.

172. Epist. 243 Ad EUAGRIUM PONT. opera P.G. 46, 1104 . Sometimes it is attributed to ST. GREGORY of NYSS. See J. N. D. KELLY, Early Christian Doctrines, op. cit., p. 268, not. 9.

173. Or. 29.2 P.G. 36, 76B. Or. 23.8 P.G. 35, 1160C.

174. G. L. PRESTIGE, God in Patristic Thought, op. cit., p. 169. Cf. M. A. ORPHANOS, Ὁ Υἱὸς καὶ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ... op. cit., p. 41.

175. Lib. Ambig. P.G. 91, 1036BC. Cf. also Mystag. P.G. 91, 700D-701AB.

176. Epist. I Ad Serap. P.G. 26, 580A.

177. Or. 25.16 P.G. 35, 1221A.

178. Or. 25.15 P.G. 35, 1220B. Cf. also ST. GREGORY of NYSS. Tract. Adv. Graec. P.G. 45, 180B. "Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος οὐδὲν τοιούτου συμβαίνει ποτε, διὰ τὸ τὰ αὐτὰ πρόσωπα, καὶ οὐχ ἕτερα καὶ ἕτερα λέγεσθαι, κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ οὐσάντιος ἔχοντα· μήτε προσθήκην τινα δέχεσθαι αὐτὴν εἰς τετραδα· μήτε μείωσιν εἰς δυάδα". ST. BASIL, De Spir. Sanct. 18 P.G. 32, 152A. "Ὁ δὲ γὰρ ἐν τῶν πατρῶν ἔστιν (sc. τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα) ὁ καὶ ἐν ἑστί. ὡς γὰρ εἰς Πατὴρ, καὶ εἰς Υἱὸς, οὕτως καὶ ἐν Πνεῦμα ἁγίον. τῆς μὲν οὖν κτιστῆς φύσεως τοσούτον ἀποκχεώρηται, ὅσον εἰς τὸ μοναδικὸν τῶν συστηματικῶν καὶ ὁληθὲν ἐκόντων".

For this reason,

ST. JO. DAMASCENUS says that no other generation is like the generation of the Son. Cf. CREDO "Πιστεύω εἰς ἓνα θεὸν Πατέρα ... καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν".

179. Or. 6.13 P.G. 35, 740A. "Ἐπεὶ κακέτην (sc. ἡ ἁγ. Τριάς) εἰς θεὸς ἔστι τε καὶ εἶναι πιστεύεται οὐχ ἥττον διὰ τὴν δμῶνοιαν ἡττητῆς οὐσίας ταυτέτητα". Cf. Or. 41.12 P.G. 36, 445A. Cf. ST. CYRIL ALEX. On Jo. 8.29 P.G. 73, 849A. Cf. J. F. BETHUNE - BAKER, The meaning of Homoousios in the "Constantinopolitan" Creed, in Texts and Studies, vol. 7, Cambridge 1901, p. 3

180. The point has been discussed in detail by ST. GREGORY of NYSSA. *Quod non sint tres Dii*, P.G. 45, 136A. "Ἡ δὲ θεία φύσις ἀ-  
παράλλακτος τε καὶ ἀδιαίρετος διὰ πλῆθους γενέσεως κατα-  
λαμβάνεται· διὰ τοῦτο κυρίως μία θεότης, καὶ εἴς θεός, καὶ τὰ  
ἄλλα πάντα τῶν θεοπρεπῶν ὀνομάτων μοναδικῶς ἐξαχχέλλεται".  
Cf. also *Tract. Adv. Graec.* P.G. 45, 176C-177A.
181. Cf. DIONYSIOS (L. PSARIANOS) bishop of Kozane (Greece), *Ὁρκο-  
δαμὴ καὶ Παράκλησις*, no. 87, Kozane 1973.
182. *Or.* 24.16 P.G. 36, 236A.
183. *Tract. Adv. Graec.* P.G. 45, 176AB and cf. the continuation of  
this passage. "Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγομεν Πατέρα θεόν, καὶ υἱόν θεόν, καὶ πνεῦμα  
Ἅγιον θεόν, ἢ θεόν Πατέρα καὶ θεόν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, τὸν καὶ σύνδεσμον  
κατ' ἐννοιαν ταῖς τῶν προσώπων ὀνόμασι συνδεδεμένον... τὸ δὲ θεὸς ὄνομα  
ἀποκρίτως καὶ ὁσαυτὼς κατηγορεῖται ἐκδοσίου τῶν προσώπων ἀνε-  
ν τοῦ καὶ συνδέσμου, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι ἡμᾶς λέγειν θεόν, καὶ θεόν,  
καὶ θεόν· ἀλλὰ νοεῖν τὸ ὄνομα τρίτον μὲν λεγόμενον τῇ φωνῇ, διὰ  
τὰ ὑποκείμενα πρόσωπα, προβαλλόμενον δὲ τῇ δευτερώσει καὶ τῇ  
τριτῶσει, ἀνεν τοῦ καὶ συνδέσμου, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἕτερον καὶ ἕτερον εἶναι  
θεόν". Ib. Later in the 15th century GENNADIUS of CONST.  
criticized GEMISTOS (PLETHON) accusing him for introducing  
numerical identity in Godhead. "οὐδ' ἀθροίζει μόνον τὰς τε-  
λειότητας τὸ τῆς θεότητος ὄνομα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν τρόπον συν-  
απτει ὡς ταύτας εἰς ἓν ἀθροίζεσθαι χρή". Περὶ τοῦ βιβλίου  
τοῦ Γεμιστοῦ καὶ κατα τῆς ἑλληνικῆς πολυθείας.  
P.G. 160, 642A.
184. D. F. WINSLOW, *The Dynamics of Salvation*, op. cit., p. 77.  
Cf. P. EVDOKIMOV, *L'Esprit Saint* ... op. cit., p. 59.  
V. LOSSKY, *The Mystical Theology* ... op. cit., p. 48. Cf.  
about "the logic of the faith". M. F. WILES, *Psychological  
Analogies in the Fathers*". In *SP 11* (1972), p. 266.
185. *Or.* 23.8 P.G. 35, 1160C. "Τριῖδα τελείαν τε τελείων  
τρίων". *Or.* 21.37 P.G. 35, 1128B. "καὶ τὸν λαὸν τὸν-  
δε διεζάχοις τέλειον τελείας τῆς Τριᾶδος προσουνητὸν". Cf.  
ST. GREG. NYSSA, P.G. 46, 912D. The idea was in common with  
Neoplatonism, cf. PLOT. *Enn.* 5.1.4, 10-17 and H. DEHNHARD,  
*Das Problem der Abhängigkeit des Basilios von Plotin* (thesis),  
Berlin 1964, p. 35.
186. *Epist.* I Ad Serap. P.G. 26, 580C. "οὐδὲ διαρεῖν αὐτὸ ἀπὸ  
τοῦ λόγου, καὶ ἀτελεῖν τὴν Τριᾶδα κατασκευάζειν". Ib. 596A.  
"Τριάς τοίνυν ἅγια καὶ τελεῖα ἐστίν, ἐν Πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι

θεολογούμενη... ὁμοία δὲ ἑαυτῇ καὶ ἀδιαίρετος  
 ἐστὶ τῆς φύσεως καὶ μιάτης ἡ ἐνέργεια". Epist. IV Ad. Serap.  
P.G. 26, 652C. "Ἀδιαίρετος γάρ ἐστι ἡ ἀγία καὶ μακάριος,  
 καὶ τέλει τριάς". The theme occurs many times in  
 the Fathers later. Cf., for example, EPIPH. P.G. 41, 1060A.  
ST. JO. DAM. Lib. de rect. sent. P.G. 94, 1421A. De Fid.  
Orth. 1.8 P.G. 94, 824B-825A.

187. Or. 25.17 P.G. 35, 1221B. Cf. H. CRAFF, The Spiritual Director in the thought of Symeon the New Theologian, In KYRIAKON, vol. 2, pp. 608-614.
188. Cf. F. M. YOUNG, A reconsideration of Alexandrian Christology, In JEH 22 (1971), p. 11. about the "παράδοξον" in Christology and M F WILES' profound analysis about the paradoxical character of the Trinitarian and Christological dogma, "Psychological Analogies in the Fathers", In SP 11 (1972), p. 264. Cf. ST MAX. CONF., Mystag. P.G. 91, 704C. "διὰ δὲ τῆς τοῦ συμβόλου τῆς πίστεως ὁμολογίας, τὴν ἐπὶ τοῖς παραδόξοις τρόποις τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν πρόσφορον ἐχάρισται".
189. Or. 31.10 P.G. 36, 144A. "τί οὖν; θεός τὸ πνεῦμα; Πάνυ γε. τί οὖν, ὁμοούσιον; Ἐπερ θεός".
190. M. A. ORPHANOS, "The procession of the Holy Spirit according to certain Greek Fathers", in THEOLOGIA 51, no. 1 (1980), p. 87, not. 2. H. B. SWETE thinks that ST. GREGORY is less careful than the other Cappadocians, to the precise use of theological terms, but without justification, The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church, London 1912, p. 245.
191. D. F. WINSLOW, "Christology and Exegesis in the Cappadocians", In CH 40 (1971), p. 390.
192. τὰ Δογματικά καὶ Συμβολικά Μνημεῖα... op. cit., p. 76.
193. Jo. 6.63. Cf. ST. JO. DAM. De imag. 3.11 P.G. 94, 1333B. "ἐκ τῶν ἰσοδυναμῶν λέξεων τῶν ἐν τῇ κειμένῳ, ὁρίσαντα ὅτι οἱ πατέρες".
194. Rom. 8, 2 and II Cor. 3, 6.
195. Jo. 15, 26 to which ST. GREGORY refers also Or. 31.8 P.G. 36, 141B.
196. The Arians also had accused ST. ATHANASIUS and the Nicene Credo for introducing terms which could not be found in Scripture. T. E. POLLARD, "The exegesis of Scripture and

- the Arian Controversy" op. cit., p. 416. ST. CYRIL of JER. objected the term "ὁμοούσιον", because he considered it as philosophical term and non-scriptural. Cf. A. A. STEPHENSON, "St. Cyril of Jerusalem", Trinitarian Theology, in SP (1972), p. 240.
197. L'Esprit Saint ... op. cit., p. 14, 92.
  198. H. B. SWETE, The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church, op. cit., p. 266. Cf. also E. R. HARDY, Christology of the later Fathers, LCHC, vol. 3, London 1954, p.
  199. M. E. HUSSEY, The Theology of the Holy Spirit in the Writing of St. Gregory of Nazianzus, op. cit., p. 227.
  200. The Synod of Antioch of 268 condemned the heresy of Paul of Samosata who used the word homoousios to identify the Father with the Logos. Cf. T. C. LAWLER, Jerome's first letter to Damasus, In KYRIAKON, vol. 2, p. 550. Cf. J. LEBON, Le sort du "consubstantiel" Nicéen, part 3, in RHE 48 (1953), pp. 632-682.
  201. D. A. SYKES, "Poemata Arcana of St. Gregory Nazianzen", In JTHS 21 (1970), pp. 36-37.
  202. Ep. 58, P.G. 37, 116. Cf.
  203. As M. ORPHANOS noticed ST. BASIL confessed publically only the divinity of the Son whom he named "Θεόν" and homoousion with the Father, but nowhere into his authentic writing could someone find a passage with confession of the divinity or the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit; the Holy Spirit is characterized "Θεὸς καὶ μακάριος ὁ υἱὸς" (Epist. 125, P.G. 32, 549B) or "Πατὴρ καὶ υἱὸς καὶ Ἅγιος Πνεύματος ὁ υἱὸς καὶ Θεός" (Epist. 210 P.G. 32, 773C). Cf. P. CHRESTOU, L'enseignement de Saint Basile sur la Saint-Esprit, op. cit., pp. 168-169. It seems that the facet was noticed early and ST. ATHANASIUS wrote to explain ST. BASIL's orthodoxy, Ep. ad Ioann. et Anct. Presb. P.G. 26, 1168A and Epist. ad Pallad. Presb. P.G. 26, 1168B. Furthermore, ST. GREGORY comes back to the same point after ST. BASIL's death, a thing that proves that there were some of his contemporaries who doubted his orthodox belief. Cf. Or. 43.68 P.G. 36, 585C sq. About ST. BASIL's aspect on this point many theories have been suggested. See B. PRUCHE, Basile de Cesaree Traite sur Saint Esprit, SC17, Paris 1947, pp. H. DÜRRIG, De Spiritu Sancto. Der Beitrag des Basilios zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas, Göttingen, 1956, p. 182. AMAND de MENDIETA, E., "The Pair "ἐκφυσμα" and "ἀδύνα" in the theological thought of St. Basil of Caesarea" in JTHS 16

(1965), pp. 129-142.. Also "The "Unwritten" and "Secret" Apostolic tradition in the theological thought of St. Basil of Caesarea", In SJTH (occas. Pap. no. 13), Edinburgh 1963.

204: P.G. 37, 193C-196A. Cf. Or. 31.8 P.G. 36, 141AB.

CHAPTER VI

NOTES

1. D. N. KOUTRAS, The sense of the light in Plotinus' aesthetics, (thesis in Greek), Athens 1968, pp.20-21.
2. The term is used here for indicating a 'formula' ('λόγος') and a name ('ὄνομα').
3. The Dionysiac element in the mysteries was parallel task with that of the Philosophers beyond the level of mind. Cf. B. N. TATAKES, Μελετήματα Χριστιανικῆς Φιλοσοφίας, Athens 1967, p.143. Cf. G. B. LADNER, The concept of the Image in the Greek Fathers and the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy, in DOP, No.7, (1953), pp.3-34.
4. "Τούτοις μὲν ὡς εἰκόσιν αὖ χρώμενοι, ζητοῦντες δὲ αὐτὰ εὐεῖα ἰδεῖν αἱ οὐκ ἂν ἄλλως ἴδοι τις ἢ τῇ διανοίᾳ".
5. 'The Symbolism of the Sun and Light in the Republic of Plato' in Classical Philology 39 (1944), p.163.
6. lb, p.164.
7. See p.10, chap. I, cf. Tim. 53<sup>d</sup>
8. Cf. ST. JO. DAM. De Imag. Or. III.17 P.G. 94, 1337C "Ἐπενοήθη ἡ εἰκὼν· πάντως δὲ πρὸς ὠφέλειαν καὶ ἐνέργειαν καὶ σωτηρίαν, ὅπως στήλιτενομένων καὶ θριαμβενομένων τῶν πασχόντων, διαγνώμεν τὰ κερρημένα, καὶ τὰ μὲν καλὰ ποθήσωμεν καὶ ζηλώσωμεν, τὰ δὲ ἐυαντία, τούτῳ τὰ κακά, ἀποστραφώμεν καὶ μισήσωμεν".
9. For example the Sun in Plato's Res Publica is a natural symbol image while the Myth of the Cave and the Mathematical Line is an artificial one. Cf. T. A. Notopoulos, op. cit., p.164.
10. Tim. 26<sup>d</sup> sq.
11. B. N. TATAKES, op. cit., p.144.
12. Cf. the diligent effort of P. Aubin, 'L'Image' dans l'oeuvre de Plotin' in Recherches de Science Religieuse, tom. XLI (1953), pp.348-379.
13. For the Greek Philosophers as well as for the Fathers the paradox is accepted, but for the first a hierarchy and a logical articulation of thought is adequate till the final outcome. Cf. J. M. RIST, Mysticism and Transcendence in Later Neoplatonism, in HERMES 92, 1964, pp.213-225.



14. B. N. TATAKES, *op. cit.*, p.146.
15. C. BIGG, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, Oxford 1886, p.49.
16. M. F. WILES, *Psychological Analogies in the Fathers*, in *Studia Patristica*, 1972 (XV), p.264.
17. Cf. F. M. YOUNG, *A Reconsideration of Alexandrian Christology*, *op. cit.*, in *JEH* (22) 1971, pp.105-106.
18. *Or.* 31 .31 *P.G.* 36, 169A.
19. Cf. PLOTINUS' fifth and sixth Ennead, *passim.* and P. AUDIN, *L' 'image' dans l'oeuvre de Plotin*, in *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, vol.41 (1953), pp.348-379.
20. Cf. ST. GREGORY the Thaumaturge, *Εἰς Ὁριζήνην Προσφωνητικός*, *P.G.* 10, 1088A sq.
21. D. N. KOUTRAS, *op. cit.*, p.20.
22. *Or.* 31 .31.
23. *lb.*
24. It is note worthy the use of the adverbs "Σαβελλίως" and "Ἀρειανῶς" with the inference that one follows either Sabellius' or Arius' theological principles.
25. *P.G.* 36, 168D-169A.
26. I cannot agree with ~~ANPNF~~'s translation of the very beginning of paragr. 31 thus: 'I have very carefully considered this matter in my own mind, and have looked at it in every point of view', which introduces dialectics in noetic realities; on the other hand NPNF refers this passage, although generally (cf. 'this matter'), to previous exposition in paragr.30
27. *Or.* 21 .29 *P.G.* 36, 165B.
28. On the other hand Christ's appellation "Εἰκὼν" is based upon the homoousion. Cf. *Or.* 30.20 *P.G.* 36, 129B "Εἰκὼν δέ, ὡς δμοούσιον, καὶ ὅτι τοῦτο ἐκείθεν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ τοῦτου Πατὴρ· ἀντί γὰρ εἰκόνας ἐνός, μίμημα εἶναι τοῦ ἀρχετύπου, καὶ οὗ λέγεται· πλὴν ὅτι καὶ πλεονέντα ὅσα ἐκεί γάρ, ἀκίνητος κινουμένου· ἐνταῦθα δέ, ζῶντος καὶ ὡσα, καὶ πλεονέχουσα τὸ ἀπαράλλακτον, ἢ τοῦ Ἀδάμ δ' εἴθ', καὶ τοῦ γεννώντος παντός τὸ γεννώμενον· τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ πῶν ἀπλῶν ἐνός, μὴ τῷ μὲν ὁικέειν, τῷ δέ ἀπεοικέειν, ἀλλ' ὅλου ὅλου τύπον εἶναι, καὶ ταῦτον μάχλον, ἢ ἀφομοίωμα". Cf. also B. N. GIANNOPOULOU, *Αἱ Χριστολογικαὶ ἀντιλήψεις τῶν Εἰ- κονομάχων*, (thesis), Athens 1975, p.131sq.

29. The terms "εἰκὼν" and "σκιά" are used in general sense here rather than in the sense of the typological interpretative method.
30. Or. 31 .33 P.G. 36, 172A.
31. 1bB.
32. Or. 31 .31 P.G. 36, 169A.
33. J. B. COTELERUS, S. S. Patrum Apostolicis, Amstelaedami, 1724, Vol. I, pp.605-606. See Appendix IV.
34. See Appendix IV.
35. ST. G. PAPADOPOULOS, Ἀθανάσιος Ἀλεξανδρείας - Περὶ Ἁγ. Πνεύματος κατὰ τὰς πρὸς Θεραπείαν Ἐπιστολὰς αὐτοῦ, Athens 1971, off-print of period. "Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος" Vol. 53 (1971).
36. See for example, Expos. Fidei, P.G. 25, 204B "ἀλλ' ὥς περ ἐκ πηγῆς ποταμὸς γεγεννημένος οὐ διηρέσθη, καὶ τοὶ δύο σχήματα καὶ δύο δόγματα τυγχάνοντα. Ὅτε γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ θεὸς ἐστίν, οὕτως ὁ θεὸς Πατὴρ ἐστίν." Cf. also De Decr. Nic. Syn. P.G. 25, 461C, De Sent. Dion. P.G. 25, 508A, and 1b, 516B.
37. Thus ST. ATHANASIUS interprets ST. DIONYSIUS doctrine and the usage of images "καὶ ἅμα ὁμολογήτωσαν καὶ ἅπερ εἶπεν ἀπολογούμενος τὸ ὁμοούσιον· καὶ τὸ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας εἶναι τὸν υἱόν, καὶ τὸ ἁγίου, καὶ τὸν νοῦν πρὸς τὸν λόγον, τὴν τε πηγὴν, καὶ τὸν ποταμόν, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα· ἵνα καὶ ἐκ τῆς διαφορᾶς γινώσι, πῶς ἑκείνα μὲν κατ' οἶκονομίαν, ταῦτα δέ, ὡς ὁ τῆς εὐσεβοῦς πίστεως βούλεται λόγος, εἴρηκε." De Sent. Dion. P.G. 25, 516B
38. Adv. Prax. Cap. VIII. P.L. 2, 162D-164A.
39. 1b, 163D-164A 'Tertius enim est Spiritus a Deo et Filio, sicut tertius a radice fructus ex frutice et tertius a fonte, rivus ex lumine et tertius a sole apex ex radio. Nihil tamen a matrice alienatur, a qua proprietates suas ducit. Ita trinitas per consertos et connexos gradus a Patre decurrens, et monarchiae nihil obstrepit, et oeconomiae statum protegit'.
40. Cf. G. BONNER, St. Augustine's Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, in SOBORNOST, Ser. 4, No.2 (1960), pp.56-58 particularly.
41. V. LOSSKY, The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church, op. cit., p.65.

42. G. BONNER, 'St. Augustine's Doctrine of the Holy Spirit', in SOBORNOST, Ser. 4, No.2, p.56.
43. LNPNF'S translation of the noun "ὀφθαλμός" by the word eye is unjustified; see LNPNF, Vol. VII, p.328. I agree with MASON who follows ELIAS CRETENSIS, op. cit., pp.187-188, n.15.
44. Or. 31 .31 P.G. 36, 169A. It is note worthy the usage of the subjunctive with the particle "μή" in order to imply a moderate denial.
45. 1b, 169A.
46. Or. 31 .4 P.G. 36, 137B. Cf. also p.18sq of chap. 3.
47. 1b, 169A.
48. 1b, 169B. Cf. p.80 of chap. III.
49. 1b.
50. Carm. I.1 P.G. 37, 415A, vers. 60.
51. Cf. Ep. Jac. 3, 11 "ὁπῇ". Cf. MASON, op. cit., p.186, note 15.
52. 1b, vers. 61-62.
53. "Ὅθεν γὰρ ἁπλοῦς ἐστὶ θεοῦ φύσις, καὶ ῥέουσα, καὶ πάλιν συν-  
ιούσα τὸ δ' ἐμπεδόν ἐστὶ θεοῦ".
54. 'The Poemata Arcana of St. Gregory Nazianzen : Some Literary Questions', in Byzantinische Zeitschrift 72 (1979), pp.6-15.
55. Cf. R. KEYDELL'S article in Byzant. Zeitschr. 44 (1951), pp.315-321.
56. D. A. SYKES, 'The Poemata Arcana of St. Gregory Nazianzen', in J.T.H.S., Vol. XXI, pt. 1 (1970), pp.41-42.
57. Ar. 3.15 P.G. 26, 352C "ἐπεὶ μηδὲ τριῶν ἡλίων ὑπεθέμεθα τὴν εἰκόνα, ἀλλὰ ἡλίον καὶ ἀπαύγασμα, καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ ἐν τῷ ἀπαύγασματι φῶς"  
Cf. LAMPES, p.605, word φῶς.
58. Adv. Prax. P.L. 2 164A. Cf. G. BONNER, op. cit., p.59.
59. A. THEODOROU, Ἡ εἰκονικὴ-Συμβολικὴ ἱκανολογία τοῦ φωτός ἐν τῇ θεολογίᾳ τοῦ Ἁγ. Γρηγ. Ναζιανζηνίου, op. cit., p.48.

60. Epist. 101, Ad Cledon. P.G. 37, 192B "Ἐκείνο γινώσκουσιν ἀναγκαῖον ὅτι Ἀπολλινάριος μὲν τὸ τῆς θεότητος ὄνομα τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι δούς, τὴν δυνάμιν τῆς θεότητος οὐκ ἐφύλαξε. τὸ γὰρ ἰεὺ μεγάλου καὶ μέζονος καὶ μεγίστου συνιστᾷ τὴν Τριάδα, ὥς περ ἐξ αὐτῆς καὶ αὐτίνος καὶ ἡλίου, τοῦ Πνεύματος καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς (ὅπερ σαφῶς ἐν ἐκείνου γέγραπται λόγοις), κλημαζέτω τὴν θεότητα, οὐκ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνέχουσα, ἀλλ' ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατέχουσα. ἡμεῖς δὲ θεὸν μὲν γινώσκουμεν τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ τὸν Υἱόν, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ταῦτα οὐ κλήσεις ψιλὰς, τεμνοῦσας ἀξιομάτων ἢ δυνάμεων ἀνισότηας, ἀλλὰ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ὥς περ προσήγοραν, οἷτω καὶ θεότητος ἐνοῖν, καὶ οὐσίαν καὶ δυνάμιν"

Cf. also THEODORETUS, P.G. 83. (IV), 425C [Αὐτοῦ (sc. Ἀπολλινάρχου) γὰρ ἔστιν εὐρημα, τὸ Μέγα, μείζον, μέγιστον ὡς μεγάλου μὲν ὄντος τοῦ Πνεύματος, τοῦ δὲ Υἱοῦ μείζονος, μεγίστου δὲ τοῦ Πατρὸς".

[Haeret. Fabul. Coup. Lib. IV. 8] : Eccl. Hist. P.G. 82. (III), 1200B "Καὶ γὰρ περὶ τῆς θείας ἐνσεως υἱοθνήλοις ἐχρήσατο λόγοις, βαθμούς τινας ἀξιομάτων γεννήσας· καὶ τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας μυστήριον ἀτελεῖς ἀποφῆναι τετόλμηκε."

61. J. A. DORNER, The Person of Christ, op. cit., Vol. II, pt. 1, p. 385.
62. Cf. in the same Epistle infra 193C-196A "προσδιορίζουσας τὸ ἐχλειπῶς εἰρημένον ἐκείνους περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος".
63. 1b, 192B.
64. 1b.
65. P.G. 82. (III), 1200B.
66. Theol. V, 1b, 169B.
67. Op. cit., p. 18f, not. ii.
68. 1b.
69. Cf. for an explicit statement of this theory the paragr. IV of the Orat. in Novan Dominican XLIV. P.G. 36, 609D-612A, and particularly the following passage, "Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τοῖς ἄλλοις τὴν ὕλην προϋποστήσας, εἰδοποίησεν ὑπερτον, ἐκδοτῶν τάξιν, καὶ σχῆμα, καὶ μέγεθος περιθεῖς, ἵνα θαυματούργησιν τι μείζον, ἐνταῦθα τὸ εἶδος τῆς ὕλης προϋπεστήσατο (εἶδος γὰρ ἡλίου τὸ φῶς) μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο τὴν ὕλην ἐπέθηκε, τὸν ἀφ' ὁρατὸν τῆς ἡμέρας δημιουργήσας τοῦτον τὸν ἡλίον".

70. P.G. 11, 1045A Cf. also PLUTARCH, De Placit. Philos. I.6-7, 879C, 881F-882A and H. DIELS, Doxogr. Gr. p.587, 15.18.
71. Paragr. 32, 1b, 169B, "ὅντε γὰρ ἀκτίς, ὅντε φῶς ἄλλος ἥλιος, ἀλλ' ἡλιακαὶ τινες ἀπόρροιαι, καὶ ποιότητες οὐσιώδεις"
72. See his commentary on PROCLUS' op. cit., p.258 not.3.
73. DAMASCIUS I.257.20.
74. Cf. the verb "οὐσιῶσθαι" P.G. 37, 1073A. Cf. J. LIEBAERT, Notes critiques, in Melanges de Science Religieuse, XXXVI, No.2, Juin 1979, p.92.
75. Cf. Or.33.16 P.G. 36, 236A where the Hypostaseis are "καθ' ἑαυτὰς ὁμοειδῶσας" in a great contradiction with the verbs "οὐσιώσωμεν, ἡμετέροισιν ὁμοειδῶσας, ποιήσωμεν" which dedicate the human will and interpretation about the divine beings.
76. Cf. ed. P. CHRESTOU, Opera Omnia, op. cit., Vol. II, p.760, note 1.
77. Cf. Theol. IV. Or. 30.18 P.G. 36, 128A "Ἡμεῖς δὲ γένειν ἐπιζητοῦμεν, ἢ τὸ εἶναι καθ' ἑαυτό, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλω συνδεδεμένον".
78. M. A. ORPHANOS, The procession of the Holy Spirit according to certain Greek Fathers, in "Θεολογία" 51 (1980), No.1, p.89. Cf. also ST. GREG. NYSS. Ad im. et ad Sim. P.G. 44, 1329BC and ST. IOAN. DAM. Expos. Fid. I.8
79. 1b. cf. ST. GREG. NYSS. P.G. 44, 1329BC.
80. Or.31.8 P.G. 36, 141B "οἱ (sc. the Holy Spirit) καθ' ὅσον μὲν ἐκεῖθεν (sc. τοῦ πατρὸς) ἐκπορεύεται οὐ κτίσμα",
81. Or.31.11 P.G. 36, 145A.
82. Or.31.13 P.G. 36, 148B "Στῆναι δὲ ὁμῶς ἀναγκαῖον πρὸς τοὺς λόγους λέσχας καὶ μὴ ἐρήμην ἀλῶναι, λόγον ἔχοντας καὶ συνηγοροῦντας πνεύματι".
83. Cf. the extensive and symbolic use of time by the Gnostics. W. C. UNNIK, The 'wise fire' in a Gnostic Eschatological vision, in I. KYRIAKON, pp.277-288.
84. Enn. VI 3, 9, 4. In HERACLEITUS, the fire is the universal law, which is of a higher class than the reason itself.

85. D. K. KOUTRAS, ἡ ἐννοία τοῦ φωτός εἰς τὴν ἀισθητικὴν τοῦ Πλωτίνου, (thesis), Athens 1968, p.21.
86. Deuter. 4, 24.
87. See Appendix I. Cf. L. PHILIPPIDES, OP. CIT., p.62sq.
88. D. K. KOUTRAS, op. cit., pp.21-22.
89. PLAT. Res. VI 507<sup>b</sup>-509<sup>c</sup>. Cf. J. M. CHARRUE, Plotin Lecteur de Platon, (thesis), Paris 1978, pp.231-258.
90. D. K. KOUTRAS, op. cit., p.23.
91. ARIST. de anim. III 5, 403<sup>a</sup> 15-25, II 7, 418<sup>b</sup> 9-11, 419<sup>a</sup> 11. Cf. W. J. VERDENIUS, 'Parmenides' conception of Light' in Mnemosyne, II (1949), pp.116-117.
92. D. K. KOUTRAS, op. cit., p.24. Cf. L. TH. SPIDLIK, S. T., Grégoire de Nazianze, Introduction a l'étude de sa doctrine spirituelle, Roma 1971, p.15sq.
93. E. GERSH, "Κίνησις ἀκίνητος", A study of Spiritual Motion in the Philosophy of Proclus, Leiden 1973, pp.83-92.
94. Enn. VI 9, 9, 6-11 "... οὐκ εἰ μένοντος ἡλίου καὶ τὸ φῶς μένει... οὐ δόντος, εἴτα ἀποστάντος ἑκείνου, ἀλλ' αἰὲν χορηγοῦντος ἕως ἂν ᾗ ὅπερ ἔστι."
95. Enn. IV 3, 4, 19-21.
96. Op. cit., p.27.
97. Enn. IV 5, 7, 4. Cf. B. N. TATAKES, Μελετήματα Χριστιανικῆς Φιλοσοφίας, Athens 1967. pp.148-149.
98. W. J. VERDENIUS, Parmenides' conception of Light, op. cit., pp.128-130.
99. Enn. IV 7, 10.
100. Gen. I, 3sq.
101. See p. 48sq. Is. 60, 19-20. Cf. Joh. I, 1, 5.
102. It must be noted here ST. SYMEON the New Theologian and ST. GREGORY PALAMAS whose doctrine may be characterized as the theology of the Divine Light.



103. A. THEODOROU, <sup>c</sup>Η εἰκονικὴ - Συμβολικὴ ἀναλογία τοῦ φωτός ἐν τῇ θεολογίᾳ τοῦ Ἀγίου Γρηγορίου Ναζιανζηνοῦ, off-print from "ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ", Athens 1976, pp.16-17. Cf. Or. 40.6 P.G. 36, 364D.
104. lb.
105. Or. 40.5 P.G. 36, 364B-C. Cf. also.
106. lb.
107. Tim. 28<sup>c</sup>
108. lb, P.G. 36, 364B.
109. Res Pub. VI 507<sup>b</sup>-509<sup>c</sup>.
110. lb, P.G. 36, 364B.
11. Enn. I, 6, 6, 13-18.
112. Enn. VI 7, 22, 1-15 "Καὶ τοίνυν ψυχὴ λαβοῦσα εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν ἐκείθεν ἀπορροήν κινεῖται καὶ ἀναβακχεύεται καὶ οἷστρων πίμπλαται καὶ ἔρωσ γίνεταί. Πρὸς τοῦδε οὐδὲ πρὸς τὸν νοῦν κινεῖται, καθὼς καλὸν ὄντα ἀρχόν τε γὰρ τὸ κάλλος αὐτοῦ, πρὶν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ φῶς λαβὴν, ὥστε τε ἀναπέπτωκεν ἡ ψυχὴ παρ' αὐτῆς καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἀρχῶς ἔχει καὶ παρόντος νοῦ ἔστι πρὸς αὐτὸν νωθὴς",
113. lb, P.G. 39, 364C.
114. lb, in paragraph 6 which follows, ST. GREGORY gives some more examples about the use of Light in the Divine Economy. See Appendix II.
115. lb, P.G. 36, 364B.
116. Cf. Or. 30.6 P.G. 36, 112B "Ἀλλ' ὅλοι θεοειδῆς, ὅλου θεοῦ χωρητικοὶ καὶ μόνου τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ τελείωσις" and Schol. by ELIAS CRET., P.G. 36, 817B.
117. Cf. LNPNT, op. cit., p.355, not. a.
118. This passage is repeated verbatim by ST. JOAN. DAM., in P.G. 94, 829B.
119. Cf. Or. 32.21 P.G. 36, 197C, Carm. I,1 P.G. 37, 1256 and 1387
120. Carm. Dogm. I,1 P.G. 37, 411 and 413.

121. Or. 44.4 P.G. 36, 609D-612A.
122. Or. 39.11 P.G. 348A "Τὰς δὲ υπερβολὰς καὶ ἐχέψαις  
ἐχέψωμεν (what rhetoric texture!) οὔτε τὴν ἐνωσιν σύγχυσεν  
ἐργαζόμενοι, οὔτε τὴν διαίρεσιν ἀποτρέψουσιν",
123. 1b.
124. Cf. also the previous paragr. 13.
125. Cf. Passage II "Ἐν γὰρ ἐν τρισὶν ἡ θεότης, καὶ τὰ τρία ἐν  
τὰ ἐν οἷς ἡ θεότης"
126. Passage I, Cf. "Τρισὶ μὲν κατὰ τὰς ἰδιότητας... ἐνὶ δεκά-  
τῃ τοῦ Πισοῦσας λόγον" (Passage II) and "Ὅταν... πρὸς τὴν θεότητα  
ἐχέψωμεν... καὶ τὴν μοναρχίαν, ἐν ἡμῖν τὸ φανταζόμενον· ὅταν δὲ πρὸς  
τὰ ἐν οἷς ἡ θεότης... τρία τὰ προσκυνοῦμενα". (Passage III).
127. Cf. A. J. MASON, op. cit., p.163, not. 2.
128. Carm. Moralia P.G. 37, 781-82.
129. Or. 30.6 P.G. 36, 112B.
130. Or. 31.3 P.G. 36, 136C. cf. APPENDIX V. p. 282.
131. p. 86
132. Or. 34.8 P.G. 36, 248D-249A.
133. 1b.
134. Cf. p. 86 of chap. IV and DIDYMUΣ ALEX., De Trin. lib. II.1 P.G. 39, 449A "Ἦτι γε μὴν ἀκατάληπτον αὐτῆς ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ πῶς ἐν  
ἔχει θέλημα, καὶ λαλεῖ, καὶ παρέχει νοινδὺν ἑαυτῆς"
135. Or. 34.8 P.G. 36, 249A "Ἄ (sc. τρία τὰ μέγιστα) μήτε οὕτως ἀλη-  
θων ἀπὴρτῆται, ὥς φέσει τέμνεσθαι, μήτε οὕτως ἐστένεται, ὥς ἂς ἐν  
πρόσωπον περιγράφεσθαι· τὸ μὲν γὰρ τῆς Ἀρειανῆς μανίας, τὸ δὲ τῆς Σα-  
βελλιανικῆς ἀθείας ἐστὶ".  
Cf. DIDYMUΣ De Trin. II.5 P.G. 39, 496C "καὶ ὥσπερ διὰ τοῦ ὕψους πάντα ἐ-  
γένετο, οὕτως ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος πάντα ἡγήσθη καὶ ἐνεδυναμώθη".  
It is obvious that ST. GREGORY borrows the schema from DIDYMUΣ.  
Cf. E. A. CLARK, clement's use of Aristotle, op. cit., p.78 and  
G. REALE, The Concept of First Philosophy and the Unity of the  
Metaphysics of Aristotle, trans. J. R. CATAN, New York 1979,  
p.21.

136. Cf. Frag. Orph. 56 (ABEL p.174), 135 (ABEL p.207), 136 (ABEL p.207).
137. How closely to ST. BASIL'S schema about the "θεογνωσία", this twofold one is! Cf. "ἡ τοίνυν ὁδὸς τῆς θεογνωσίας ἐστὶν ἀπὸ ἑνὸς Πνεύματος, διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς υἱοῦ, ἐπὶ τὸν ἕνα Πατέρα· καὶ ἀναπαύω, ἡ ἑνσοικὴ ἀγαθότης, καὶ ὁ κατὰ φύσιν ἁγιασμός, καὶ τὸ θεολογικὸν ἄζιωμα, ἐκ Πατρὸς, διὰ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς ἐπὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα <sup>οὐκ ἐκεί</sup> De Spir. Sanct. 18 P.G. 32, 153C. Cf. etiam I.196.1, 221, 13, II.36.13. KROLL, op. cit., p.73 says that 'proclo enim ubique schema tripertitum venanti haec observabatur series: 1. οὐσία, ὕπαρξις, πατήρ 2. ζωή, δύναμις 3. νοῦς, ἐνέργεια Cf. DAMASCIUS I, 309, 24. Cf. also I, 286.8 "καὶ τοὶ τί ποιήσομεν, θύαντες πατρικὸς νοῦς παρ- ὁρῶν κέχηται τὰς τριαδικὰς διακοσμήσεις, ὕψους, συνοχέας, τελετάρχας".
138. Cf. Oracula Chaldaica, ap. PROCL. Theol. Plat. 240, 23: "Διὰ τί οὖν αὐτὸ καὶ οἱ τελετάρχαι συνδιήκωνται τοῖς συνοχεύουσιν; οὐδὲν πρῶτος τὰ ἔσχατα ἔχων (Plat. Parm. 145a) ἡνιοχεῖ τὸ παρὸν τοῦ πυρός (hoc ex Oraculis petitum videtur), ὁ δὲ μέσος ἀρχὰς καὶ τέλη καὶ μέσα περιέχων τελειοῖ τὸν αἰθέρα τριπλῶν ὄντων καὶ αὐτὸν, (see KROLL, op. cit., p.32), ὁ δὲ τρίτος... τὴν ἀσχημάτιστον ὕλην τελειοῖ καὶ ἀμορφον".
139. P.G. 36, 137D.
140. Op. cit., p.150, not. 3.
141. P.G. 36, 826A-C and not. 9-13. Cf. also ib, 832C-833B.
142. Or. 12.2 P.G. 35, 844AB and Or. 23.11 P.G. 35, 1161C-1164B
143. De Trin. II P.G. 49, 496AB "καὶ ὁν τρόπον λόγος γέγραπται ὁ υἱὸς διὰ τὸ συννύσκειν τῇ Πατρὶ, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα γέγραπται, ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ πνεῦμα τοῦ σπύματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ πνοὴ παντοκράτορος, ἐπεὶ δὲ συννυφασθῶς ἐξέλαμψεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ".
144. J. THEODORAKOPOULOS, Πλάτων, Πρωτοτύπος, Ὁριγένους, Athens 1959, p.49. Cf. PLOT. Enn. V 3, 5, 43-48. M. A. ΣΙΟΤΟΥ, Ἑλληνικὴ δαιμόνιος καὶ χριστιανικὴ πλοῦσις, Athens 1971, p.39.
145. Ib, 1164B.
146. De imag. I P.G. 94, 1241BC.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

SOURCES.

The quotations from Christian Authors are given after Patrologia, series Graeca and Latina, (J. P. MIGNE), while for the Greek Philosophers we refer to the Classical Series of OXFORD. Particularly concerning ST. GREGORY we have always taken into account the exist modern editions, although we have referred only to P.G.

Orationes 1-45: Patrologia Graeca 35-36 (J. P. MIGNE)

The five Theological Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus, ed. A. J. MASON, Cambridge 1899.

Discours 1-3: éd. J. BERNADI, SC. 247, Paris 1978.

Discours 20-23: éd. J. MOSSAY, SC 270, Paris 1980.

Discours théologiques: éd. P. GALLAY, SC. 250, Paris 1978.

EPISTOLAE: Patrologia Graeca 37 (J. P. MIGNE)

Lettres: Saint Gregoire de Nazianze, Lettres: éd. P. GALLAY, CUF, tom. 1, Paris 1964, tom. 9, Paris 1967. Gregor von Nazianz, Brief: éd. P. GALLAY, GCS, Berlin 1969. Lettres théologiques: éd. P. GALLAY, SC. 208, Paris 1974.

Gregor von Nazianz, De vita sua..., éd. von C. JUNGK, Heidelberg, 1974.

POEMATATA: Patrologia Graeca 37-38 (J. P. MIGNE).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Modern Works

AFANASSIEF, N. Ἡ Ἐκκλησία τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, in per. GREGORIOS PALAMAS, no. 56/635 (1973) pp. 184-195 (trans. in Greek by N. JOANNIDES).

AGOURIDES, S. "ὅς καὶ εἰσπορεύεται κατὰ τοὺς Καππαδόκας", in Ekk1. 43 (1966), no. 7, pp. 152-157.

ALEBIZATOS, A. C. Οἱ ἐλεροὶ κανόνες, Athens, 1949

ALEXANDER, P. J. Religious and Political History and Thought in the Byzantine Empire, London 1978.

ALTANER, B. Patrology, New York 1960.

ARMSTRONG, H. A. Plotinian and Christian Studies, London 1979.

———— and MARCUS, R. A. Christian Faith and Greek Religion, London 1964.

AUDIN, P. "L'image" dans l'oeuvre de Plotin, RSR 41 (1953), pp. 348-379.

BAILLEUX, E. Le personalism Trinitaire des Peres Grecs, MSR 27 (1970), part 1, pp. 3-25.

BALANOS, D. S. Οἱ Πατέρες καὶ οἱ συγγραφῆς τῆς ἀρχαίας Ἐκκλησίας, Athens 1961.

BALAS, D. L. "The Unity of human nature in Basil's and Gregory of Nyssa's polemics against Eunomius", SP 14 (1976), pp. 273-281.

BARCLAY, W. Educational Ideals in the Ancient World, London 1959.

BARDY, G. "Philosophie" et "philosophe" dans le vocabulaire des premiers siècles, ZAM 25 (1949), pp. 97-108.

BARR, J. The Semantics of Biblical Language, Oxford 1961.

BATE, H. N. "Some technical terms of Greek exegesis", JTHS 24 (1923), pp. 59-66.

BENAKES, L. M. Ἡ σπουδὴ τῆς Βυζαντινῆς φιλοσοφίας, in per. PHILOSOPHIA 1 (1971), pp. 390-433.

- BENOIT, A. St. Grégoire de Nazianze, sa Vie, ses Oeuvres et son Époque, Paris 1876 (Repr. New York 1973).
- BERNARDI, J. "La formula πῶς εἶσιν : Saint Jean Chrysostome a-t-il imité Saint Grégoire de Nazianze?", SP 1 (1957), pp. 177-181.
- "Grégoire de Nazianze critique de Julien", SP 14 (1976), pp. 282-289.
- BETHUNE, J. F.-BETHUNE-BAKER, "The Meaning of Homousios in the "Constantinopolitan" Creed," Texts and Studies, vol. 7, Cambridge 1901, pp. 1-83.
- BIGG, C. The Christian Platonists of Alexandria, Oxford 1886.
- BLUND, J. J. On the Right Use of the Early Fathers, London 1857.
- BOBRINSKOY, B. "Βασίλειος ὁ Μέγας καὶ ἡ ἑμβάθυνσις τῆς θεολογίας τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος κατὰ τὸν 4ον αἰῶνα". In "Ὁρθόδοξος Μαρτυρία καὶ Σκέψις" 1980, no. 23: pp. 7-14, no 24: pp. 4-10.
- BONES, K. G. Ἀμφιλόχιος ὁ ἱκονίου καὶ Μέγας Βασίλειος, Thessaloniki 1949.
- Γρηγόριος ὁ θεολόγος, Athens 1953.
- BONNER, G. "St. Augustine's doctrine of the Holy Spirit," In SOB, Ser. 4, no. 2 (1960), pp. 51-66.
- BOUKES, CH. Ν. Ἡ θεολογία κατὰ Γρηγόριον τὸν Ναζιανζηνόν, θεολογικὸν συνέδριον, A Festschrift Prof. P. K. CHRESTOU, Thessaloniki 1967, pp. 143-163.
- BOUSOULAS, N.-J.S. Ἡ δημιουργικότης τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ἡ μεταφυσικὴ τῆς πλατωνικῆς μετέως, Thessaloniki (without date).
- BRATSIOTES, P. I. Ἡ διὰ μέσον τῶν αἰώνων ἐπιβίωσις τῶν τριῶν ἱεραρχῶν, Athens 1972.
- BROWN, P. The World of Late Antiquity, London 1971.
- BURESCH, B. Ἀπόλλων Κλάριος, Leipzig 1889.
- CALLAHAN, J. F. "Greek philosophy and the Cappadocian Cosmology," DOP 12 (1958), pp. 29-57.



- CANTARELLA, R. Basilio Minimo II, BZ 26 (1926), pp. 1-34.
- CAMERON, A. Gregory of Nazianzus and Apollo, JTHS 20 (1969), pp. 240-241.
- CAMPBELL, J. M. The Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Style of the Sermons of St. Basil the Great, Washington 1922.
- CAMPENHAUSEN, von H. The Fathers of the Greek Church, London 1963, pp. 101-114.
- CHADWICK, H. Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition, Studies in Justin, Clement and Origen, Oxford 1971.
- CHADWICK, O. John Cassian, Cambridge 1968.
- CHARLES, R. H. Hebrew, Jewish and Christian Eschatology, London 1913.
- CHARLESWORTH, M. P. "Providentia and Aeternitas", HTHR 29 (1936), pp. 107-132.
- CHARRUE, J.-M. Plotin lecteur de Platon (thesis), Paris 1978.
- CHRESTOU, P. K. Γρηγόριος ὁ Θεολόγος, ETHE 4 (1964), cols. 708-729.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Θεολογικὰ Μελετήματα, Thessaloniki 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Ὁ Μέγας Βασίλειος, Βίος καὶ Πολιτεία, Ἐξηγήματα, Θεολογικὴ Σκέψις, Thessaloniki 1978.
- CLARK, E. A. Clement's use of Aristotle, The Aristotelian contribution to Clement of Alexandria's refutation of Gnosticism, New York - Toronto 1977.
- CLARKE, M. L. Higher Education in the Ancient World, London 1971.
- CLEMENT, O. Τρία Ἰσοκείμενα περὶ Ὁρθοδοξίας, Athens 1962.
- COMAN, J. "Hellenisme et christianisme dans le 25<sup>e</sup> Discours de Saint Grégoire de Nazianze", SP 14 (1976), pp. 290-301.
- CROUZEL, H. Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origène, Aubier 1956.
- CUMMINGS, J. T. "Lexical notes on St. Gregory Nazianzen", GRBS 9 (1968), pp. 183-191.

- \_\_\_\_\_, "Towards a critical edition of the Carmen de Vita sua of St. Gregory Nazianzen", SP 7 (1966), pp. 52-59.
- DAILLE, J. A treatise on the right use of the Fathers, London 1841.
- DALEY, B. "The Origenism of Leontius of Byzantium", JTHS 27 (1976), pp. 333-369.
- DANIÉLOU, J. Platonisme et théologie mystique, essai sur la doctrine spirituelle de Saint Grégoire Nysse, Paris 1944.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The conception of history in the Christian tradition", JR 30 (1950), pp. 171-179.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The theology of Jewish Christianity, London - Philadelphia 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Grégoire de Nysse a travers les lettres de S. Basile et de S. Grégoire de Nazianze", VC 19 (1965), pp. 31-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Grégoire de Nysse et le neo-platonisme de l'école d'Athènes", REG 80 (1967), pp. 395-401.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "A new vision of Christian origins: Judaeo-Christianity", In Cross Currents 18 (1968), pp. 163-173.
- \_\_\_\_\_, L'être et le temps chez Grégoire de Nysse, Leiden 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "La Θεωρία chez Grégoire de Nysse", SP (1972), pp. 130-145.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture, London - Philadelphia 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Grégoire de Nysse et l'origine de la Fête de l'Ascension", In KYRIAKON, vol. 2, pp. 663-666.
- DAVIS, N. Z. "Gregory Nazianzen in the service of humanist social reform", RQ 20 (1967), no. 4, pp. 455-464.
- DEHNHARD, H. Das Problem der Abhängigkeit des Basilius von Plotin, Berlin 1964.
- DILLON, J. M. Iamblichus Chalcideusis, In Platonis Dialogos Commentariorum Fragmenta, Leiden 1973.

- DODDS, E. R. "Tradition and personal achievement in the philosophy of Plotinus", JRS 50 (1960), pp. 1-7.
- , "Theurgy and its relationship to Neoplatonism", JRS 37 (1947), pp. 55-69.
- DORNER, J. A. History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, Edinburgh 1862, vol. 2, div. I.
- DÜRRIE, H. "Die Epiphanias. Predigt des Gregor von Nazianz (Hom. 39) und Ihre Geistesgeschichtliche Bedeutung", in KYRIAKON, vol. 1, pp. 409-423.
- DRAGAS, G. D. Athanasiana, Essays in the Theology of Saint Athanasius, London 1980.
- , The Meaning of Theology, An Essay in Greek Patristics, Darlington 1980.
- DRÄSEKE, J. "Neuplatonisches in des Gregorios von Nazianz Trinitätslehre", BZ 15 (1906), pp.
- EMDOKIMOV, P. L'Esprit Saint dans la tradition d'orthodoxe (trans. in Greek by S. K. PLEURAKES), Thessaloniki 1973.
- , L'Orthodoxie, (thesis), (trans. in Greek by A. T. MOURTSOPOULOS), Salonica 1972.
- FLEURY, E. Saint Gregoire de Nazianze et son Temps, Paris 1930.
- FLOROVSKY, G. "Eschatology in the Patristic age: An introduction", SP 2 (1957), pp. 235-250.
- , "Saint Gregory Palamas and the tradition of the Fathers", in SOB, ser. 4, no. 4 (1961), pp. 165-176.
- , "The authority of the ancient councils and the tradition of the Fathers: An introduction", Festschrift für E. BENZ, ed. G. MÜLLER - W. ZELLER, Leiden 1967, pp. 177-188.
- , Creation and Redemption, Belmont (U.S.A.), 1976.
- , "The fourth century", in SOB, ser. 7, no. 6 (1978), pp. 432-447.
- , "The function of Tradition of the Ancient Church", in GÖTHR 9:2 (1963) pp. 181-200.

- FONKIC, B. I. Греческие рукописи охессы, in Византийский Временник, том. 39 (1978), pp. 184-199.
- HABRA, G. "The sources of the doctrine of Gregory Palamas on the Divine Energies," ECHQ 12 (1957-58), pp. 244-252, 294-303.
- HANSON, R. P. C. "The Church and tradition in the Pre-Nicene Fathers," SJTH 12 (1959), pp. 21-31.
- Origen's Doctrine of Tradition, London 1954.
- Basil's Doctrine of Tradition in relation to the Holy Spirit, in VCH 22(1968), pp. 241-255.
- HARDY, E. R. "Christology of the Later Fathers," LCC, vol. 3, pp. 15-40, London 1954.
- HARKIANAKIS, S. "Die Trinitätslehre Gregor von Nazianz," In KLERONOMIA 1 (1969), pp. 83-102.
- , Τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ὡς ἑρμηνεύς τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου καὶ ζωο-  
δοτῆς τῆς σημερινῆς Ἐκκλησίας, In KLERONOMIA 4 (1972), pp. 403-422.
- HARNACK, A. History of Dogma, vol. 4-5, New York 1963.
- HERON, A. "The two Pseudo-Athanasian dialogues against the Anomoeans," JTHS, 24 (1973), part 1, pp. 101-122.
- HOLWERDA, D. Commentatio de vocis quae est φύσις vi atque usa  
praesertim in Graecitate Aristotele Anteriore, Groningae 1955.
- HUSSEY, M. E. "The theology of the Holy Spirit in the writings of St. Gregory of Nazianzus," in per. DIAKONIA, 14:3 (1979), pp. 224-233.
- GALLAY, P. La vie de Saint Gregoire de Nazianze, Paris 1943.
- Langue et style de Saint Grégoire de Nazianze, Paris 1933.
- GEERARD, M. Clavis Patrum Graecorum, Brepols - Turnhout 1974, pp. 179-209.
- GERSH, S. Ε. Κίνησις Ἀκίνητος, A Study of Spiritual Motion in the Philosophy of Proclus, Leiden 1973.
- GILSON, E. The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy, London 1936.
- GLOVER, T. R. Life and Letters in the Fourth Century, Cambridge 1901.

GRAESER, A. Plotinus and the Stoics, Leiden 1972.

GOGGIN, TH. A. The Times of Saint Gregory of Nyssa as Reflected in the Letters and the Contra Eunomium, Washington 1947.

GREGG, R. C. Consolation Philosophy, Greek and Christian Paideia in Basil and the two Gregories, Philadelphia (U.S.A.) 1975.

GUIGNET, M. Saint Grégoire de Nazianze et la Rhétorique, Paris 1911.

ILURTH, X. De Gregorii Nazianzeni orationibus funeribus, Strasburgh 1907.

JAEGER, W. W. Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture, Oxford 1939-1945.

——— The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers, Oxford 1947.

——— Early Christianity and Greek Paideia, Cambridge 1962.  
JEVTICH, A. "Between the 'Micaeans' and the 'Easterners' the 'Catholic' Confession of Saint Basil," in SVTTHQ, 24:4 (1980), pp. 235-252 (trans. A. RAKITA).

JONES, A. H. The social background of the struggle between Paganism and Christianity, In The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century, ed. A. MOMIGLIANO, Oxford 1963.

KARABIDOPOULOS, J. D. Ἡ περὶ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου διδασκαλία φιλώ-  
τος τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως, In THEOLOGIA (off-print), Athens 1966.

KARMIRES, J. Δογματικά καὶ Συμβολικά Μνημεῖα, vol. 1, Athens 1960.

——— Ἡ Ἐκκλησιολογία τοῦ Ἁγίου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου, Athens 1960.

——— Ἡ Ἐκκλησιολογία τῶν Τριῶν Ἱεραρχῶν, Athens 1962.

——— "Τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ", In Ekk1, 46 (1969), pp. 552-555.

KELLY, J. N. D. Early Christian Creeds, London 1972

——— Early Christian Doctrines, London 1958.

- KERTSCH, M. "Ergänzende bemerkungen zum Aufsatz ein Bildhafter vergleich bei Seneca, Themistios, Gregor von Nazianz und sein kynischstoischer Hintergrund", VC 31 (1977), pp. 298-307.
- KING, N. Q. "The 150 Holy Fathers of the Council of Constantinople 381 A.D.", SP 1 (1957), pp. 635-641.
- KOOPS, M. A. Observations in hymnos Orphicos, Leiden 1932.
- KOPECEK, TH. A. "The Cappadocian Fathers and civic Patriotism", CH 43 (1974), pp. 293-303.
- , "The social class of the Cappadocian Fathers", CH 42 (1973), pp. 453-466.
- KRIVOSHEIN, B. "The ascetic and theological teaching of Gregory Palamas", ECHQ 3 (1938), no. 1: pp. 26-33, no. 2: pp. 71-84, no. 3: pp. 138-156, no. 4: pp. 193-214.
- KOUTRAS, D. N. CH ἑνναία τοῦ φωτός εἰς τὴν ἀποθητικὴν τοῦ Πλωτίνου (thesis), Athens 1968.
- KYRIAKON <sup>tp</sup> Festschrift J. QUASTEN, ed. P. GRANFIELD - J. A. JUNGSMANN, Münster Westf. 1970, vol. 1-2.
- LADNER, G. B. "The concept of the image in the Greek Fathers and the Byzantine iconoclastic controversy", DOP 7 (1953), pp. 1-34.
- , The Philosophical Anthropology of Saint Gregory of Nyssa, in DOP 12 (1958) pp. 59-94.
- LAISTNER, M. L. W. Christianity and Pagan Culture, New York 1951.
- LEBON, J. "Le sort du "consubstantiel" Nicéen", part 2, in RHE 48 (1953), pp. 632-682.
- LEIBAERT, J. "Notes critiques, l'oeuvre de Saint Grégoire de Nazianze", MSR 36.2 (1979), pp. 91-96.
- LILLA, S. R. C. "The notion of infinitude in Ps. - Dionysius Areopagita", JTHS 31.7 (1980), pp.
- LOSSKY, V. The Vision of God, London 1963.
- , The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church, Cambridge - London 1973.
- , In the Image and Likeness of God, London - Oxford 1975.



- MACLEOD, C. W. <sup>"</sup> Ἀγάλλσις: A study in ancient mysticism, JTHS 21 (1970), pp. 43-55.
- MANTSARIDES, G. <sup>"</sup> Ἡ ἔννοια τῆς θεολογίας", in KLERONOMIA 1 (1969), pp. 103-120.
- MARCUS, R. A. <sup>"</sup> Trinitarian theology and economy, JTHS 9 (1958), pp. 88-102.
- MARROU, H. I. A History of Education in Antiquity, New York 1956.
- MARTLAND, T. R. <sup>"</sup> A study of Cappadocian and Augustinian Trinitarian Methodology, ATHR 47 (1965), pp. 252-265.
- MEEHAN, D. <sup>"</sup> Editions of Saint Gregory of Nazianzus, ITHQ 18 (1951), pp. 203-219.
- MEIJERING, E. P. Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius, Leiden 1968.
- , God being History, Studies in Patristic Philosophy, Amsterdam - Oxford - New York 1975.
- MENDIETA de AMANO, The ""Unwritten" and "Secret" Apostolic Tradition in the Theological Thought of St. Basil of Caesarea, Edinburgh 1965.
- MEREDITH, A. <sup>"</sup> Traditional apologetic in the contra Eunomium of Gregory of Nyssa, SP 14 (1976), pp. 315-319.
- MEYENDORF, J. Introduction a l'étude de Grégoire Palamas, Paris 1959.
- , Byzantine Theology, New York 1974.
- MCINTYRE, J. <sup>"</sup> Analogy, SJTH 12 (1959), pp. 1-20.
- , <sup>"</sup> The Holy Spirit in Greek Patristic thought, SJTH 7 (1954), pp. 353-375.
- MORESCHINI, C. <sup>"</sup> L'opera e la personalita dell' imperatore Giuliano nelle due "invektivae" di Gregorio Nazianzeno, in FORMA FUTURI, Festschrift M. PELLEGRINO, Torino 1975, pp. 416-430.
- MORGAN, C. An Investigation of the Trinity of Plato and Philo Judaeus, Cambridge 1853.

- MOSSAY, J. La mort et l'au-delà dans Saint Grégoire de Nazianze, Louvain 1966.
- , "La prédication "liturgique" de Grégoire de Nazianze", SP 10 (1970), pp. 402-406.
- , "Note sur Grégoire de Nazianze, Oratio 8, §21-22", SP (1975), pp. 113-118.
- NOCK, A. D. "A vision of Mandulis Aion", HTHR 27 (1934), pp. 53-104.
- , "The exegesis of Timaeus 28C", VC 16 (1962), pp. 79-86.
- NORDEN, E. "Unedirte Scholien zu den Reden Gregors von Nazianz", Z. für W. TH. 1893, pp. 441-447.
- , "Scholia in Gregorii Nazianzeni Orationes Inedita", HERMES 27 (1892), pp. 606-642.
- NORET, J. Un fragment de Grégoire de Nazianze à Odessa, In Analecta Bollandiana 97 (1979), no. 3-4, p. 372.
- NOTOPOULOS, J. A. "The symbolism of the sun and light in the Republic of Plato", CPH 39 (1944), pp. 163-172.
- ORPHANOS, M. A. Ὁ Νεὸς καὶ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐς τὴν Τριάδα — λογία τῶν Μ. Βασιλέων (thesis), Athens 1976.
- , "The procession of the Holy Spirit according to certain Greek Fathers", in THEOLOGIA 51.1 (1980), pp. 87-107.
- OTIS, B. "Cappadocian thought as a coherent system", DOP 12 (1958), pp. 97-124.
- , "The throne and the mountain, An essay on St. Gregory Nazianzus", CJ 56 (1961), pp. 146-195.
- , "Gregory of Nyssa and the Cappadocian conception of time", SP 14 (1976), pp. 326-357.
- PAPADOPOULOS, S. G. "Ἀθανάσιος Ἀλεξανδρείας περὶ Ἁγ. Πνεύματος, κατὰ τὰς πρὸς ῥεφανίωνα ἐπιστολάς αὐτοῦ" in ECCLESIASTIKOS PHAROS 43.1 (1971), off-print, Athens 1971.
- , Γρηγόριος ὁ Θεολόγος καὶ αἱ πρὸς πρὸς δέσεις πνευματολογίας αὐτοῦ, Athens 1975.

- \_\_\_\_\_, Πατέρες καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, Athens 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Μεγάλου Βασιλείου Βιογραφικὸ σημεῖωμα", In CHURCH and THEOLOGY 1 (1980)
- PAPADOPOULOU, O. - TSANANA, C. Η ἀνθρωπολογία τοῦ Μεγάλου Βασιλείου, (thesis), Thessaloniki 1970.
- PETIT de JULLEVILLE, L. L'école d'Athènes au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle après Jesus-Christ, Paris 1868.
- PETRIDES, S. "Notes d'hymnographie byzantine", BZ 13 (1904), pp. 421-428.
- PHILIPPIDES, L. J. Ἱστορία τῆς ἑποχῆς τῆς κατ'ἡμᾶς Διαθήκης, Athens 1958.
- PINAULT, H. La platonisme de Saint Grégoire de Nazianze (these), La Roche sur Yon 1925.
- PLAGNIEUX, J. Saint Grégoire de Nazianze, Theologien, Paris 1951.
- PLASS, P., Transcendent time and eternity in Gregory of Nyssa, In VCH 34 (1980) pp. 180-192
- POLLARD, T. E. "The Origins of Arianism", JTHS 9 (1958), pp. 103-111.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The exegesis of Scripture and the Arian Controversy", in Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 41 (1959), pp. 414-429.
- PRESTIGE, G. L. God in Patristic Thought, London - Toronto 1936.
- \* PSARIANOS, D. L. Λόγος παρακλήσεως, (intro.), KOZANE 1967.
- PUECH, A. Histoire de la Littérature Grecque Chrétienne, vol. 3, pp. 34-131, Paris 1930.
- QUASTEN, J. Patrology, vol. 3, Westminster 1960.
- QUERE, F. - JAULMES, "L'aumone chez Grégoire de Nysse et Grégoire de Nazianze", SP 8 (1966), pp. 449-455.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Les Peres Sont-ils Jansenistes? Remarques sur la traduction classique de Grégoire de Nazianze", RSR 45 (1971), pp. 270-275.
- QUISPEL, G. "The Origins of the Gnostic Demiurge", in KYRIAKON, vol. 1, pp. 271-276.
- \* PRUCHE, B., Δόγμα et Κήρυγμα dans le traité Sur le saint-Esprit de Saint Basil de Césarée en Cappadoce, In SP 9:3 (1966) pp. 257-262.

- RADOVIĆ, A. <sup>1</sup> "Ο Τριαδολογικός χαρακτήρ τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Πνευματο-  
πορίας ", in Θεολογικά Μελέτηματα, ed.  
"Ὁ ἄγιος τῆς ζωῆς", Athens 1971, pp. 7-31.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Mystery of the Holy Trinity according to St. Gregory Palamas (thesis), Thessaloniki 1973.
- REALE, G. The Concept of First Philosophy and the Unity of the Metaphysics of Aristotle, New York 1979.
- REITZENSTEIN, R. Hellenistic Mystery-Religions, Pittsburg (U.S.A.) 1978.
- RIST, J. M. "Mysticism and transcendence in later Neoplatonism", in HERMES 92 (1964), pp. 213-225.
- ROLDANUS, J. Le Christ et l'homme dans la Théologie d'Athanase d'Alexandrie, Leiden 1968.
- ROMANIDES, J. S. Τὸ προπατορικὸν ἁμάρτημα (thesis), Thessaloniki 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Κριτικὸς ἐλεγχος τῶν ἐφαρμογῶν τῆς θεολογίας", in Festschrift to Metropolitan Chalkedonos MELITON, Thessaloniki 1977, pp. 473-509.
- ROUSSE, J. Gregoire de Nazianze, Dictionnaire de la Spiritualite, vol. , cols. 932-971.
- RUDBERG, S. Y. "Στήλαι οὐκ ἀκίνητοι", A metaphor in letter 154 of Gregory of Nazianzus", In KYRIAKON, vol. 1, pp.
- RUETHER, R. R. Gregory of Nazianzus, Oxford 1969.
- SCHOEDEL, W. R. "A neglected motive for second century Trinitarianism", JTHS 31 (1980), part 2, pp. 356-367.
- SIDER, R. D. "Tertullian, on the shows: An analysis", JTHS 39 (1978), pp. 339-365.
- SIOTOU, M. A. Ἑλληνικὴ διανόησις καὶ χριστιανικὴ πίστις, Athens 1971.
- SCOUTERES, K. Ἡ ἐννοια τῶν ὄρων "θεολογία", "θεολογεῖν", "θεολόγος" ὡς τῆ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἑλλήνων πατέρων καὶ ἑκκλησιαστικῶν συγγραφέων μέχρι καὶ τῶν καππαδοκῶν, Athens 1972.

- SMITH, A. Porphyry's Place in the Neoplatonic Tradition, Hague 1974.
- SPIDLIK, T. Gregoire de Nazianze, Introduction a l'etude de sa doctrine spirituelle, Roma 1971.
- , "La theoria et la praxis chez Gregoire de Nazianze", SP14 (1976), pp. 358-364.
- STEAD, G. C. "The THALIA of Arius and the testimony of Athanasius", JTHS 29 (1978), pp. 20-52.
- STEPHENSON, A. A. "S. Cyril of Jerusalem's Trinitarian theology", SP 11 (1972), pp. 234-241.
- STRUNK, O. St. Gregory of Nazianzus and the proper hymns for Easter: Late classical and mediaeval studies in honour of A. M. FRIEND, ed. K. WEITZMANN, Princeton 1955, pp. 82-87.
- SYKES, D. A. "The Poemata Arcana of St. Gregory Nazianzen", JTHS 21 (1970), pp. 32-42.
- , "The Poemata Arcana of St. Gregory Nazianzen", BZ 72 (1979), pp. 6-15.
- SWETE, B. The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church, London 1912.
- SZYMUSIAK, C.-M. - AFFHOLDER, "Psychologie et histoire dans le reve initial de Grégoire le Théologien", In PHILOLOGUS 115 (1971), pp. 303-310.
- SZYMUSIAK, J. T. Grégoire le Théologien. Aux sources de la pensee Chretienne, Poznan 1965.
- , "Grégoire de Nazianze et le péché", SP 9 (1966), pp. 288-305.
- , Elements de théologie de l'homme selon Saint Grégoire de Nazianze, Rome 1963.
- , "Pour une chronologie des discours des St. Grégoire de Nazianze", VC 20 (1966), pp. 183-189.
- , "Grégoire le Théologien disciple d'Athanase", in Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie, ed. C. KANNENGISSER, Paris 1974.

TATAKES, B. N. Θέματα χριστιανικῆς καὶ βυζαντινῆς φιλοσοφίας, Athens 1952.

—, Ἡ συμβολὴ τῆς Καππαδοκίας εἰς τὴν χριστιανικὴν σκέψιν, Athens 1960.

—, Μελετήματα χριστιανικῆς φιλοσοφίας, Athens 1967.

—, "Ἑλληνικὴ Πατερικὴ καὶ βυζαντινὴ φιλοσοφία", in per. DEUKALION 14 (1975), off-print, Athens 1975.

—, Ἡ βυζαντινὴ φιλοσοφία, Athens 1977.

THEODORAKOPOULOS, J. Πλάτων, Πλωτῖνος, Ὡριγένης, Athens 1959.

THEODOROU, A. Ἡ περὶ θεώσεως τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διδασκαλία τῶν Ἑλλήνων Πατέρων μέχρι Ἰωάννου τοῦ Ὡριγένους, Athens 1956.

—, Ἡ θεολογία τοῦ Ἰουστίνου, φιλοσόφου καὶ Μάρτυρος, καὶ αἱ σχέσεις αὐτῆς πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν φιλοσοφίαν, Athens 1960.

—, Ἡ περὶ ἑκπορεύσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος διδασκαλία Κυρίλλου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ Ἐπιφάνου Κνύπρου, Athens 1974.

—, Ἡ εἰκονικὴ - Συμβολικὴ ἀναλογία τοῦ φωτός ἐν τῇ θεολογίᾳ τοῦ Ἁγίου Γρηγορίου Ναζιανζηνοῦ, off-print, Athens 1976.

THOMSON, F. J. "Economy, An examination of the various theories of economy held within the Orthodox Church, with special reference to the economical recognition of the validity of Non-Orthodox sacraments", JTHS 16 (1965), pp. 368-420.

TRISOGLIO, G. La poesia della Trinita nell'opera letteraria di San Gregorio di Nazianzo, in FOPMAFUTURI Torino 1975.

—, "San Gregorio di Nazianzo in un quarantennio di studi (1925-1965)", Riv. Las. 40 (1973), pp. 5-462.

TSAMES, D. G. Ἡ διαλεκτικὴ γνώσις τῆς διδασκαλίας Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου, (thesis), Thessaloniki 1969.



\_\_\_\_\_, CH περί μεσότητος διδασκαλία Γρηγορίου τοῦ θεολόγου, in KLERONOMIA 1 (1969), pp. 275-283.

\_\_\_\_\_, Ἡ ὁγδοὴ ἡμέρα, Thessaloniki 1973.

TURNER, H. E. W. The pattern of Christian truth. A study in the relations between Orthodoxy and heresy in the early Church, London 1954.

ULMAN, C. Gregory of Nazianzum, London 1851.

VERDENIUS, W. J. "Parmenides' conception of light", In MNEMOSYNE 2 (1949), pp. 116-131.

WAGNER, M. M. Rufinus, The Translator, A study of his theory and his practice as illustrated in his version of the Apologetica of St. Gregory Nazianzen, Washington 1945.

WALTER, C. "Liturgy and the illustration of Gregory of Nazianzen's Homiles", REB 29 (1971), pp. 185-212.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Biographical scenes of the three hierarchies", REB 36 (1978), pp. 233-260.

WESTERINK, L. G. "Proclus, Procopius, Psellus", in MNEMOSYNE 10:3 (1942), pp. 275-280.

WHITTAKER, J. "Proclus, Procopius, Psellus and the scholia on Gregory Nazianzen", CH 29 (1975), pp. 309-313.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Ammonius on the Delphic E", CQ 63 (1969), pp. 185-192.

WICKHAM, L. R. - WILLIAMS, F. J. "Some notes on the text of Gregory Nazianzen's first theological oration", SP 14 (1976), pp. 365-370.

WILES, M. F. "Soteriological arguments in the Fathers", SP 9 (1966), pp. 321-325.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Psychological analogies in the Fathers", SP 11 (1972), pp. 264-267.

WINSLOW, D. F. The concept of salvation in the writings of Gregory of Nazianzus, Diss. Harvard Un. Cambridge 1967.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Christology and exegesis in the Cappadocians", CH 40 (1971), pp. 389-396.

- \_\_\_\_\_, "Orthodox Baptism - A problem for Gregory of Nazianzus",  
SP 14 (1976), pp. 371-376.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Dynamics of Salvation: A Study in Gregory of  
Nazianzus (thesis), Philadelphia (U.S.A.) 1979.
- WOLFSON, H. A. Philo, Cambridge - Massachusetts 1948, vol. 1-2.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Philosophy of the Church Fathers, Cambridge 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Philosophical implications of Arianism and  
Appolinarism", DOP 12 (1958), pp. 5-28.
- YAMAMURA, K. "The development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit  
in Patristic Philosophy: St. Basil and St. Gregory of  
Nyssa", STVTHQ 18 (1974), pp. 3-21.
- YANNARAS, CH. Proclamation and articulation of the Christian  
faith in the New Valamo consultation, New Valamo (Finland)  
1977, pp. 65-70.
- YOUNG, F. M. "A reconsideration of Alexandrian Christology",  
JEH 22 (1971), pp. 101-114.

# APPENDIX I

In turn we will attempt to see how the well known theme of the three Earthquakes has been interpreted by Patristic thought. At first referring to the Bible itself we may mark the existence of three relevant passages. The so called first earthquake is that of Exod. 19, 19<sup>1</sup> at the giving of the Law on Mt. Sinai, which is an allusion to the Incarnation.<sup>2</sup> The second earthquake is mentioned in Matth. 27, 51<sup>3</sup> and the third one consecrates the end of the world in Hebr. 12, 26-29.<sup>4</sup>

THEOPHYLACTUS BULGARIAE ARCHIEPISCOPUS, (1040-1127), a famous pupil of PSELLOS<sup>5</sup>, commenting on the above mentioned passage of Matthew<sup>6</sup> gives the definition of the world "σεισμός" saying: "Τὸν σεισμόν ἡ Γῆ αὐτὴ ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων μεταθέσεως ἑστάναι",<sup>5</sup> and interprets the word "μετάθεσις" referring it to the activity of the supervision of God.<sup>6</sup> ST. CYRIL ALEX. in making a comment on Hagg. 2, 6 refers also to Hebr. 12, 27, in order to elucidate the meaning of the verb "σεισθήσεται" and identifies it with the third earthquake: "σεισθήσεται, φησὶν (sc. St. Paul) ἐκείνο δηλοῦν, ὅτι τῶν σαλευομένων ἔσται μετάθεσις, ἵνα μὴ τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα".<sup>7</sup>

Another meaning of the biblical word "σεισμός" is given by OECUMENIUS TRICCAE, he says: "σεισμόν. δὲ λέγει τὸ εἶναι ἐξ ἀκουστοῦ τοῦ κηρύγματος, δι' οὗ ἐσεύθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς πάλαι ἐν τῇ ἀλάτῃ σάσεως καὶ μετηνέχθησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι",<sup>8</sup> a definition more apt to the manifestation of the Son (cf. κήρυγμα), than to the other two

Persons. In addition it must be noted that the verb "μετενέχθησαν" has a parallel meaning to that of the word "μετάστασις", used by ST. GREGORY, viz. it is referred to "τὰ μὲν δὲ σαλευόμενα".<sup>9</sup> THEODORETUS CYR. speaks of the first earthquake commenting on Hebr. 12, 26-28 "Ἐσαλεύθη γὰρ τὸ ὄρος τοῦ θεοῦ σημεῖον τῆς ἐπιφανείας".<sup>10</sup> In this passage the word "ἐπιφάνεια" means the manifestation of God and simultaneously it is a proof of divine election. ST. GREGORY identifies the manifestation of God with the Birthday of Christ ("ἡ εορτή").<sup>11</sup>

PHOTIUS identifies the second earthquake with the time of the New Testament.<sup>12</sup> But the Father who gives a compromised and general view of the whole Patristic tradition on the point at issue, is

Theophylactus Bulg. His resume is worthy of an extensive quotation; he comments on Hebr. 12, 26, thus: "Ὁν σειςμὸν ἔχομεν ἀπὸ τῆς τραγῆς γενομένης. πρότερον μὲν τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς Διτῆς νομοθεσίας. Γὰρ γὰρ, φησὶν ὁ Θεὸς, ἐσεῖσθη.<sup>13</sup> δεύτερον δὲ τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐν σαρκὶ ἐπιδημίας. Ἐσεῖσθη γὰρ, φησὶ, πᾶσα ἱερουσαλήμ.<sup>14</sup> καὶ, σεισθήσεται τὰ χειροποίητα τῆς ἀργύτου.<sup>15</sup> Ἐσεῖσθησαν γὰρ, τουτέστι τῆς τοῦ πλαντῶν τοὺς ταῦτα σεβομένους σιδσεως ἀπεκινήθησαν, καὶ κατεβλήθη ἡ ἰσχὺς αὐτῶν. Τὸ οὖν ἔτι ἄπαξ, τρίτον σεισμὸν δηλοῖ, τὸν μετὰ τὸν δεύτερον συμβησόμενον, ἡγουν τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ κόσμου καινοτομίαν, ὅτε μεταστήσονται τὰ πάντα, ἀπὸ φθορᾶς εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν.<sup>16</sup> ἐναλλατόμενα".<sup>17</sup>

So far as we have seen there is a meaning of unity in the schema "μετάθεσις" - "σεισμός" - "διαθήκη", that prolongs the Patristic tradition most intrinsically after ST. GREGORY.

APPENDIX II

L. PHILIPPIDES<sup>1</sup> summarized the properties by which the Orphic poetry characterizes this one god as follows: "θεὸς ἀληθὴς καὶ μέγας.<sup>2</sup> ὑπέρχρονος<sup>3</sup> γεγονότων, γινομένων καὶ γενησομένων κύριος.<sup>4</sup> ἀθάνατος.<sup>5</sup> ζωῆς φῶς,<sup>6</sup> αὐτόζωος<sup>7</sup> καὶ ζωοδότης.<sup>8</sup> αὐτοπάτωρ,<sup>9</sup> ἦτοι ἀπάτωρ καὶ ἄρα ἀγέννητος, αὐτογενής,<sup>10</sup> πρωτόγονος<sup>11</sup> ἢ ἀρχιγένεθλος<sup>12</sup> καὶ γεννήτωρ τῶν πάντων,<sup>13</sup> διὰ τῆς μίας τριωνύμου (...) δυνάμεως τὰ πάντα δημιουργήσας...<sup>14</sup> (οἱ θεοὶ "οὐκ ἔξ ἀρχῆς... ἦσαν, ἀλλ' οὕτως γέγονεν αὐτῶν ἕκαστος, ὡς γινόμεθα ἡμεῖς").<sup>15</sup> αὐτοτελής...<sup>16</sup> ἀρχή, μέσον καὶ τέλος,<sup>17</sup> ἀρχὴ πάντων...<sup>18</sup> ὡς ποιητικὸν αἴτιον τῶν πάντων,<sup>19</sup> ὅθεν καὶ πάσης ἐπώνυμος φύσεως τε καὶ τύχης.<sup>20</sup> μέσον,<sup>21</sup> ὡς ἔξ ἴσου τοῖς πᾶσι παρών, καίπερ ἀνίσως αὐτοῦ μετέχουσιν.<sup>22</sup> τέλος αὐτός, ὕστατος...<sup>23</sup> ὡς τὸ τελικὸν τῶν πάντων αἴτιον.<sup>24</sup> ἀρχὸν ἀπάντων,<sup>25</sup> βασιλεὺς<sup>26</sup> μέγας... μέγιστος<sup>27</sup> καὶ μοναδικός,<sup>28</sup> μόνος τοῦ κόσμου ἀναξ.<sup>29</sup> πατὴρ μακάρων τε θεῶν ἡδὲ ἀνδρῶν.<sup>30</sup> δαίμονες ὃν φρίσσουσι, θεῶν δὲ δέδδοικεν ὁμίλλιος.<sup>31</sup> δεσπότης τοῦ κόσμου, θρόνον ἔχων χρυσοῦν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν,<sup>32</sup> ἐπουράνιος ἢ οὐράνιος,<sup>33</sup> ὑποπόδιον τὴν γῆν,<sup>34</sup> χθόνιος,<sup>35</sup> δι-εκτείνων τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ τέρματα τοῦ ὠκεανοῦ,<sup>37</sup> τρόμος τῶν ὀρέων,<sup>38</sup> φρικτός, ἀήττητος.<sup>39</sup> ἀρρενόθηλος,<sup>40</sup> τὰ πάντα θέπων αὐτός,<sup>41</sup> ἀλλ' ἀόρατος τοῖς θνητοῖς,<sup>42</sup> τῷ νῶ μόνον ὁρατός.<sup>43</sup> τῶν ἀγαθῶν δοτὴρ καὶ τῶν κακῶν αἴτιος<sup>44</sup> καὶ ἀναίτιος.<sup>45</sup> τὸ φανότατον τῶν νοητῶν, ὁ νοῦς ὁ νοητὸς καὶ τὸ ἀποστίχθον φῶς τὸ νοητόν.<sup>46</sup> περίληπτικός τῶν νοητῶν ἰδεῶν,<sup>47</sup> ἐν ᾧ πρώτως αἰνοῦνται τῶν ὄλων αἰτίαι,<sup>48</sup> Ὀρφεὺς φάνηται τε τὸν θεὸν τοῦτον προσηγόρευσεν ὡς ἐκφαίνοντα τὰς νοητὰς ἐνάδας.<sup>49</sup> τῶν δὲ ἰδεῶν πλήρης ὢν διὰ τούτων ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰ ὅλα περιείληφε... πάντα τὰ ἐγκόσμια,

θεοὺς τε καὶ μοίρας τοῦ παντός" <sup>50</sup>

The variety of the names by which the Greek polytheon is named describes the One and only being god, according to his manifestation and energy through the nature, as the following Orphic fragment explicitly reveals:

Ἑρμῆς δ' ἑρμηνεύς τῶν πάντων ἄγγελός ἐστι,  
Νύμφαι ὕδωρ, πῦρ Ἡφαιστός, σίτος Δημήτηρ·  
ἥ δὲ θαλάσση Ποσειδάων μέγας ἠδ' Ἐνοσίχθων·  
καὶ πόλεμος μὲν Ἄρης, ἑρῆνῃ δ' ἐστ' Ἀφροδίτη.  
οἶνος, τὸν φιλέουσι θεοὶ ὀνητοὶ τ' ἄνθρωποι,  
ὃν τε βροτοῖς εὖρεν λυπῶν κηλήτορα πασῶν  
ταυρογενῆς Σιώνυσος, εὐφροσύνην πόρε ὀνητοῖς  
ἠδίστην, πάσῃσι τ' ἐν εἰλαπίνῃσι παρέσσι·  
καὶ Θέμις, ἥπερ ἅπασι θεμιστεύει τὰ δίκαια,  
Ἥλιος, ὃν καλέουσιν Ἀπόλλωνα κλυτότοξον,  
Φοῖβον ἑκπρεχέτην, μάντιν πάντων ἐκἀεργον,  
Ἰητῆρα νόσων Ἀσκληπιόν, ἐν τὰδε πάντα. <sup>51</sup>



# APPENDIX III

The point is a broad hint to the Neoplatonic theory of the first and second cause by effluence, a theme that has been discussed in detail in the second Theol. Oratio, thus: "Ὁν γὰρ δὴ ὑπέρχουσιν ἀγαθότητος εἰπεῖν θαρρήσομεν (ὅτι τῶν παρ' ἡλλήσι φιλοσοφησάντων εἰπεῖν τις ἐτόλμησεν, ὅσον κρατήρ τις ὑπερρῖνῃ, σαφῶς οὐκ ὀσεί λέγων, ἐν οἷς περὶ πρώτου ἀγίου καὶ δευτέρου φιλοσοφεῖ), μή ποτε ἀκούσιον. τὴν γέννησιν εἰσαγάγωμεν... Διὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ὄρων ἱστάμενοι, τὸ ἀγέννητον εἰσάγωμεν, καὶ τὸ γεννητὸν, καὶ τὸ ἐπορευόμενον, ὡς πού φησιν αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ λόγος"

(Jo. 25.26) Or. 29.2 P.G. 36, 76C. Right well ELIAS CRET. comments on

this passage the Platonic tendency towards subordination "Πλατωνικὸν ἔνταυθα διασύρει (sc. ST. GREGORY) δόγμα. Τρία γὰρ ταῦτα διαίρων ἐκείνος, ἑνδειαν, αὐτάρκειαν καὶ ὑπέρχουσιν, μίαν αὐτῶν, τὴν ὑπέρχουσιν, τῇ δαίρῃ φέσει προσήρμοζεν" P.G. 36, 805B. On the other hand ELIAS tries to compromise the phrase "ὑπέρχουσιν ἀγαθότητος" of Or. 29.2 with that one

of Or. 45.5 P.G. 36, 629A "ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐκ ἦρκει τῇ ἀγαθότητι τοῦτο, τὸ κινεῖσθαι μόνον τῇ ἐαυτῆς θεωρίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἔδει χεῖναι τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ ὁδεῦσαι", saying that in the first case he denies to apply it to God, "ὡς τὸ ἀκούσιον εἰσάγονσαν",<sup>1</sup> whereas in the second one ST. GREGORY, as ELIAS alleges, emphasizes with it the divine goodness, especially by the addition "καὶ ὁδεῦσαι δι' εὐεργεσίαν".

J. WHITTAKER thinks that by the phrase "τῶν παρ' Ἐλληνισ-  
 φιλοσοφιστῶν τις" ST. GREGORY hints at PLOTINUS, and suggests  
 instead of the word "κρατήρ" the word "πηγή" (fountain),<sup>2</sup> rather with-  
 out justification, as there is a witness from AREOPAGETICA according  
 the mixing-bowl<sup>being of</sup> a symbolic character "Ὁ μὲν οὖν κρατήρ, περιφερὴς  
 ὢν καὶ ἀναπεπτημένος, σύμβολον ἔστω τῆς ἀνηπλωμένης ἅμα καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα  
 περιττῶρενομένης ἀνάρχου καὶ ἀτελευτήτου τῶν ὄντων προνοίας",<sup>3</sup>  
 an interpretation close to JAMBLICHUS' one in Tim. 41D.<sup>4</sup>

APPENDIX IV

Sancti Petri principis Apostolorum; ex Clementinis

"Ἐπειδὴ δὲ φθάσας εἶπον χειραγωγίαν εἶναι τῶν νοητῶν  
τὰ αἰσθητὰ, πρὸς τὸ οἷον ὁδῶ χρησαμένους ἀσφαλῆ καὶ βε-  
βαίαν τὴν τῆς θεολογίας ἔκθεσιν ποιήσαυτε· φέρε διαβάθρα χρῆσώμεθα  
τῇ εἰκόνι πρὸς εὐρεσιν τοῦ ἀρχετύπου.<sup>5</sup> Ὁ λογικὸς ἄνθρωπος κατ'εἰκόνα  
γεγονώς θεοῦ καὶ καθ' ὁμολωσιν, φέρει ἑν᾽ αὐτῷ συμβολικῶς τοῦ  
ποιήσαντος τὴν μίμησιν. ἔχει γὰρ ἑν᾽ αὐτῷ πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ  
πνεῦμα. Καὶ λέγω πῶς ὁ μὲν νοῦς, πατρὸς τῶπου ἑπέχει· υἱοῦ  
δὲ, ὁ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τικτόμενος λόγος· καὶ ἡ ἑννηχος φωνὴ τῆς  
προφορᾶς, τὸ πνεῦμα παρίστησι. Καὶ ὥσπερ οὐ προϋπάρχει πο-  
τὲ τοῦ ἐνδιαθέτου λόγου ὁ γεννήσας αὐτὸν νοῦς, οὕτως οὐδὲ  
τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου ὁ γεννήσας αὐτὸν πατήρ. Καὶ πάλιν ὥσπερ οὐ  
προϋπάρχει τοῦ πλοῦτου ἡμῶν πνεύματος ὁ αἰσθητὸς λόγος, οὕ-  
τως οὐδὲ τοῦ θείου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ πνεύματος ὁ θεὸς λόγος·  
καθὼς καὶ τὸ πρότερον ἀπέδειξε παράδειγμα. Καὶ μετ' ὁ-  
λίγα· Εἰ γὰρ φῶς μὲν ἡλίου γέννημα, ὁμοίως καὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ αὐγὴ, καὶ  
ποταμοῦ πρὸ βλήμα, οὐ προϋπῆρχε δὲ ποτέ, οὔτε τοῦ φωτὸς ἡλίου, οὔτε τῆς αὐγῆς  
ὀφθαλμός, οὔτε τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἡ πηγὴ· ἅμα γὰρ ἐπενοήσας ἥλιον, ἅμα συνεπινοή-  
σεις αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τικτόμενον φῶς· καὶ ἅμα ἐπινοήσεις ὀφθαλμόν,  
ἅμα συνεπινοήσεις αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ προϊούσαν αὐγὴν· ὥς καὶ τῇ  
πηγῇ τὸν ποταμὸν συνεπινοοῦμεν οὕτως νοητέον καὶ ἐπὶ Πατρὸς καὶ  
υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος".

SS. Patrum Apostolicis, by J. B. COEHLERUS, Amstelaedami, 1724, vol. I,

pp. 605-606.

APPENDIX ΣΑ

Or. 40.6 P.G. 36, 364D-365B" Φῶς μὲν ἦν καὶ ἡ τῷ πρωτοχόνῳ δοθεῖσα  
 πρωτόγονος ἐντολή (ἐπειδὴ Λύχνος ἐντολή νόμου καὶ φῶς.<sup>1</sup> καὶ διότι,  
 φῶς τὰ προστάγματα σου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς)<sup>2</sup> εἰ καὶ τὸ φθονερὸν σκότος  
 ἐπεισεχθὼν τὴν κακίαν ἐδημιούργησεν· φῶς δὲ τυπικὸν καὶ σὺμ-  
 μετρον τοῖς ὑποδεχομένοις, ὁ γραπτὸς νόμος, σκιαγραφῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν  
 καὶ τὸ τοῦ μεγάλου φωτὸς μυστήριον· εἶπερ καὶ τὸ Μωυσέως πρόσω-  
 πον τούτῳ δοξάζεται. καὶ ἵνα πλεονα φῶτα δῶμεν τῷ λόγῳ, φῶς  
 μὲν ἦν ἐκ πυρὸς τῷ Μωϋσεὶ φανταζόμενον, ἥνλικα τὴν βάτον ἔκαιε  
 μεν, οὐ κατέκαυε δέ, ἵνα καὶ τὴν ἐξοὺν παραδείξῃ καὶ γνωρίσῃ  
 τὴν ἐνναμιν.<sup>3</sup> φῶς δέ, τὸ ἐν στύλῳ πυρὸς ὁδηγήσαν τὸν Ἰσραὴλ<sup>4</sup>  
 καὶ ἡμερῶσαν τὴν ἔρημον· φῶς, τὸ ἥλιον ἀρπάσαν ἐν τῷ τοῦ τυ-  
 ρὸς ἄρματι<sup>5</sup> καὶ μὴ συμφλέξαν τὸν ἀρπαζόμενον· φῶς, τὸ τοὺς  
 ποιμένας περιεστράψαι<sup>6</sup>, ἥνλικα τὸ ἀχρονον φῶς τῷ χρονικῷ ἐμί-  
 γνυτο· φῶς, τὸ τοῦ προδραμόντος ἀστέρος ἐπὶ Βηθλεὲμ κάλλος,  
 ἵνα καὶ μάχους ὁδηγήσῃ<sup>7</sup> καὶ δορυφορήσῃ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς φῶς, μετ'  
 ἡμῶν γενόμενον φῶς, ἡ παραδείχθεῖσα θεότης ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους τοῖς  
 μαθηταῖς, μικροῦ στερροτέρα δὲ ὄψεως.<sup>8</sup> φῶς, ἡ Παῦλον περιεστρά-  
 ψασα φαντασία καὶ ἀληγῇ τῶν ὄψεων τὸν σκότον τῆς ψυχῆς θερα-  
 πεύσασα.<sup>9</sup> φῶς καὶ ἡ ἐκείθεν λαμπρότης, τοῖς ἐνταῦθα κεκαθα-  
 μένοις, ἥνλικα ἐκλάμψουσιν οἱ δίκαιοι ὥς ὁ ἥλιος<sup>10</sup>, ὧν ἴσεται ὁ  
 θεὸς ἐν μέσῳ, θεῶν ὄντων καὶ βασιλέων, διαστέλλων καὶ διαίρων  
 ταῖς ἀξίαις τῆς ἐκείθεν μακαριότητος· φῶς παρὰ ταῦτα ἰδιοτρό-  
 πως, ὁ τοῦ βασιλείου φωτισμός, περὶ οὗ νῦν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος, μέ-  
 γα καὶ θαυμαστὸν τὸ τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν περιέχον μυστή-  
 ριον".

APPENDIX I

NOTES

1. "Τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σινα ἑκαπνίζετο ὅλον διὰ τὸ καταβέβηκέναι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸν θεὸν ἐν πυρί"
2. Hagg. 2, 6 "Ἐτι ἅπασι ἔγω σείσω τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ τὴν ξηρὰν, καὶ συσείσω πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ ἔξει τὰ ἐκλεκτὰ πάντων τῶν ἔθνων"
3. "καὶ ἰδοὺ, τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἑσχίσθη εἰς δύο ἀπὸ ἀνωθεν ἕως κάτω, καὶ ἡ γῆ ἑσείσθη, καὶ αἱ πέτραι ἑσχίσθησαν, καὶ τὰ μνημεῖα ἀνεψώθησαν".
4. "Ὅθι ἡ φωνὴ τὴν γῆν ἐσάλευσε τότε, ὡς δὲ ἀπὸ γῆλται λέγων, ἔτι ἅπασι ἔγω σείσω οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν. Τὸ δὲ ἅπασι δηλοῖ τὴν τῶν σαλευομένων μετάθεσιν, ὡς πεποιημένων, ἵνα μείνῃ τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα. οὐδὲ βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον παραλαμβάνοντες ἔχωμεν χάριν, δι' ἧς λατρεύωμεν εὐαρέστως τῷ θεῷ μετὰ εὐχαρί-  
ας καὶ δέους· καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκων".  
Cf. C. SPICQ, L'Épître au Hebreux, Paris 1959, tom. 2, pp. 411-412, not. 26, 27.
5. Enarr. in Euag. Matth. P.G. 123, 473A.
6. 1b, "Ἐγένετο οὖν ἡ μετάθεσις τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπισκοπῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἰουδαίων ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη". Cf. also about the curtain ("καταπέτασμα") which was hanging in the Temple, which had been torn in two from top to bottom. 1b, 472D.
7. P.G. 71, 1060B. Cf. also EUTH. ZIGABENUS, Comm. in Matth. P.G. 129, 733CD.
8. P.G. 119, 438D.
9. Cf. also ST. JO. CHRYS. Hom. 32 Ad Hebr. P.G. 63, 223 "Ποῖα δὲ ἐστὶ τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα; Τὰ μέλλοντα"  
THEOPHORETUS CYR., P.G. 82, 777D "τὴν ἐπὶ τὰ κρείττω μετάστασιν, ἅπερ μόνιμον λοιπὸν ἔξει τὴν φύσιν". Cf. also THEOPHYLACTUS BULG., P.G. 125, 385CD and ST. GREGORY PALAMAS, Or. 1.1 (P. CHRESTOU) vol. I, p. 55.

10. P.G. 82, 777C.
11. Or. 38.3 P.G. 36, 513C. Cf. Carm. Dogm. I.1 P.G. 37, 428A, vers. 53-57 and COSMAS HIEROS., Schol. P.G. 38, 463-464. Or. 4.110 P.G. 35, 648A and E. ABEL, Frag. Orph. 40, p.164. Also A. CAMERON, Gregory of Nazianzus and Apollo, in JTHS, 20 (1969), pp.240-241.
12. P.G. 101, 1209B. Cf. ST. CYRIL ALEX. P.G. 72, 407B.
13. Ps. 65, 9.
14. Matth. 2, 3.
15. Isa. 19, 1.
16. Hagg. 2, 7.
17. P.G. 125, 385BC.



APPENDIX II

NOTES

1. Op. cit., p. 5459.
2. LACTANDIUS, Divinarum Institutionum 1.5, P.L. 6.130A.
3. Abel, p. 62, VII/13.
4. CLEM, Alex. Strom. 5, 14 P.G. 9, 129<sup>β</sup> sq
5. Abel, p. 62, VII/13.
6. lb, p. 62, VII/78.
7. lb, p. 176, fr. 58.
8. lb, p. 167, fr. 46.5.
9. lb, p. 67, XV/7 according to Cod. Thryllitianus.
10. lb, p. 145/8a cf. also CLEM, Alex. Strom. 5.12 P.G. 9, 116
11. Abel, p. 167/46.1, cf. LACTANDIUS, lb. 'Deum verum et magnum  
Πρωτόγονον', primogenitum appellat; quod ante ipsum nihil  
sit genitum, sed ab ipso sind cuncta generata'.
12. Abel, p. 202, frag. 123, 7.
13. Ibid., p. 145, fr. 8b; also p. 157, fr. 33, p. 167, fr. 46.2.
14. lb, p. 182, fr. 76 "Διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν τριῶν ὀνομάτων, μίας δὲ θεότητος  
τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο", cf. lb, p. 183, fr. 76, p. 174, fr. 56.
15. lb, p. 163, fr. 39, cf. also p. 189, fr. 94.
16. lb, p. 147, frag. 6, vers. 10.
17. lb, p. 146, fr. 5, vers. 30 and p. 157, fr. 33, cf. also Plato, Leg.  
IV, 715E, Joseph. Κατὰ Ἀπὼνδρος, Orat. B, 22 (190): "ἀρχὴ  
καὶ μέσος καὶ τέλος οὗτος τῶν πάντων".
18. lb, p. 167, frag. 46.2.
19. lb, p. 157, fr. 33.
20. lb, p. 167, fr. 46.

21. lb, p.167, fr.46.2.
22. lb, p.157, fr.33.
23. lb, p.167, fr.46.1.
24. lb, p.157, fr.33.
25. lb, p.167, fr.46.7, cf. p.202, fr.123 also.
26. lb, p.167, fr.46.7.
27. lb, p.70, XX/5.
28. lb, p.145, fr.4, vers. 13, cf. also p.147, fr.6, vers. 16a.  
See also CLEMENT, Alex. Strom. 5.14 P.G. 9, 1938
29. Abel, p.145, fr.4, cf. CLEM, Strom. 5.14 P.G. 9, 184A
30. Abel, p.67, XV/7 according to Cod. Thyllitianus.
31. CLEM, Strom. 5.14 P.G. 9, 185A
32. Abel, p.145, fr.4, 17-18.
33. lb, p.146, fr.5, cf. CLEM, Strom. 5.14 P.G. 9, 184B
34. Abel, p.167, fr.46.
35. lb, p.145, fr.4.
36. lb, p.146, fr.5.
37. lb, p.145, fr.4.
38. lb, p.146, fr.5.
39. CLEM, Strom. 5.14 P.G. 9, 185B
40. Abel, p.167, fr.46.4 and p.178, fr.62.
41. lb, p.145, fr.4.
42. lb.
43. lb, p.147, fr.6.
44. lb, p.145, fr.4.
45. lb, p.147, fr.6.
46. lb, p.175, fr.58.

47. lb, p.199, fr.119.

48. lb, p.201, fr.121, 122.

49. lb, p.198, fr.119.

50. lb, p.201, fr.121.

51. lb, p.217, fr.161.

APPENDIX III

NOTES

1. Cf. E. P. MEIJERING, 'The doctrine of the will and of the Trinity in the Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus', in God Being History, Studies in Patristic Philosophy, Amsterdam - Oxford 1975, pp.103-113.
2. 'Proclus, Procopius, Psellus and the Scholia on Gregory Nazianzen' in V.CH. 29 (1975), p.309. Cf. also L. G. WESTERINK, 'Proclus, Procopius, Psellus', in MNEMOSYNE 10, Ser. 3 (1942), pp.275-280.
3. Epist. 9.3 P.G. 3, 1109 . Cf. ST. MAXIM. Lib. Ambig. P.G. 91, 1289AB.
4. J. M. DILLON, Jamblichus Chalcidensis ... op. cit., p.45. Cf. also Tim. 34<sup>b</sup> - 35<sup>b</sup>, 41<sup>d</sup> and PLOT. Enn. 5.1.8, 5.2.1 and PROCL. Theol. Plat. chap. 131.

APPENDIX V

NOTES

1. Psal. 118, 105.
2. Prov. 6, 23.
3. Exod. 3, 2.
4. Exod. 13, 21.
5. IV Reg. 2, 11.
6. Luc. 2, 9.
7. Matth. 2, 9.
8. 1b. 17, 1sq.
9. Act. 9, 3.
10. Sap. 3, 7.